DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 179 089 FL 010 622

AUTHOR Inman, Marianne
TITLE Foreign Languages, English as a Second/Foreign Language, and the U.S. Multinational Corporation. Language in Education: Theory and Practice, No. 16.
INSTITUTION ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics, Arlington, Va.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE May 78
NOTE 48p.
AVAILABLE FROM Center for Applied Linguistics, 1611 North Kent Street, Arlington, VA 22209 ($4.95)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Business: Cross Cultural Training; *English (Second Language); Foreign Countries; *Foreign Nationals; Foreign Workers; International Relations; Interpreters; Job Enrichment; Job Skills; Language Instruction; Language Programs; *Overseas Employment; *Second Language Learning; Second Languages; Teaching Methods; *Translation

ABSTRACT

Characteristics of corporate language training programs and policies, and the role of translation and interpreting were studied. Of particular interest was the extent to which language requirements and language training are included in corporate planning. Also investigated was the extent to which occupationally oriented special purpose language training is included in the language training provided to corporate employees. Responses were obtained to a 12-page questionnaire from 129 American firms doing business abroad. Among the findings are the following: (1) Spanish is the language most studied by U.S nationals going abroad to work and also the language most involved in translation and interpreting; (2) U.S. corporations doing business abroad rely primarily on English as the business and the means of communication; (3) language training is provided to a majority of U.S. national employees going overseas and outranks technical, cultural, and managerial training in the type of training provided; (4) languages for special purposes training is only rarely included in U.S. national employees' preassignment language instruction; (5) English is generally the language in which technical training is given to non-U.S. national employees overseas; and (6) a far greater commitment exists to language training (specifically English language training) for non-U.S. national employees than for U.S. national employees. A bibliography is included. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED179089

LANGUAGE IN EDUCATION: THEORY AND PRACTICE

16

Foreign Languages, English as a Second/Foreign Language, and the U.S. Multinational Corporation

Marianne Inman

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Center for Applied Linguistics

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Published by

Center for Applied Linguistics

Prepared by

ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics

Language in Education: Theory and Practice
Series ISBN: 87281-092-5

ISBN: 87281-102-6

May 1978
Copyright © 1978
By the Center for Applied Linguistics
1611 North Kent Street
Arlington, Virginia 22209

Printed in the U.S.A.

LANGUAGE IN EDUCATION: THEORY AND PRACTICE

ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center) is a nationwide network of information centers, each responsible for a given educational level or field of study. ERIC is supported by the National Institute of Education of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The basic objective of ERIC is to make current developments in educational research, instruction, and personnel preparation more readily accessible to educators and members of related professions.

ERIC/CLL. The ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics (ERIC/CLL), one of the specialized clearinghouses in the ERIC system, is operated by the Center for Applied Linguistics. ERIC/CLL is specifically responsible for the collection and dissemination of information in the general area of research and application in languages, linguistics, and language teaching and learning.

LANGUAGE IN EDUCATION: THEORY AND PRACTICE. In addition to processing information, ERIC/CLL is also involved in information synthesis and analysis. The Clearinghouse commissions recognized authorities in languages and linguistics to write analyses of the current issues in their areas of specialty. The resultant documents, intended for use by educators and researchers, are published under the title Language in Education: Theory and Practice.* The series includes practical guides for classroom teachers, extensive state-of-the-art papers, and selected bibliographies.

The material in this publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages and Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either ACTFL, TESOL, or NIE.

This publication may be purchased directly from the Center for Applied Linguistics. It also will be announced in the ERIC monthly abstract journal *Resources in Education* (*RIE*) and will be available from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, Computer Microfilm International Corp., P.O. Box 190, Arlington, VA 22210. See *RIE* for ordering information and ED number.

For further information on the ERIC system, ERIC/CLL, and Center/Clearinghouse publications, write to ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics, Center for Applied Linguistics, 1611 N. Kent St., Arlington, VA 22209.

**From 1974 through 1977, all Clearinghouse publications appeared as the CAL·ERIC/CLL Series on Languages and Linguistics. Although more papers are being added to the original series, the majority of the ERIC/CLL information analysis products will be included in the Language in Education series.*

CONTENTS

Introduction ix

Language Training for American Expatriates 1

Language Training for Non-U.S. National Employees 10

Translation and Interpreting in the Business Environment 13

Foreign Languages and Career Education 17

Languages for Special Purposes 21

Summary and Recommendations 24

Notes 27

Bibliography 29

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1
Type of Pre-Assignment Training Provided Employees Going Overseas by Type of Overseas Operation 2

Table 2
Company Language Policy 3

Table 3
Number of Companies Contacting Language Organizations, Associations 4

Table 4
Means by Which Translation and Interpreting Requirements Are Met 14

Table 5
Languages Involved Most in Translation and Interpreting 16

Sincere thanks and appreciation are extended to all those corporate staff members who so generously participated in this study.

Marianne Inman

INTRODUCTION

Considerable U.S. corporate resources are expended each year for foreign language training--both for U.S. nationals (specifically, native speakers of English) going abroad and for non-U.S. national company employees around the world--and on translation and interpreting requirements.[1] Foreign language training is often provided as a benefit to American international employees, and more often as a requirement for non-English-speaking employees. The presence of American products, services, trainers, advisers, and employers--both military and civilian--throughout the world has led to a significant effort in English teaching and technical training. While corporations have traditionally met their language-training needs by contracting programs with commercial or academic language-teaching organizations or institutions, companies in increasing numbers are adding language coordinators to their staffs to handle the growing language requirements for training Americans going abroad to work, local nationals overseas working in their own countries, or limited English-speaking employees within the United States.

Truly the role of language and communication in international business cannot be overlooked, for in most cases at least one individual in every communicative interchange is operating in a language that is not native for him or her. The implications of this situation on the operating and planning policies of the international corporation are profound, even though the language issue per se has all too often been ignored.

A study was conducted by the writer in the fall of 1977 to examine characteristics of corporate language training programs and policies, and the role of translation and interpreting (Inman 1978a). Of particular interest were the extent to which language requirements and language training are included in corporate planning and the extent to which occupationally oriented special purpose language training is included in the language training provided to corporate employees. A twelve-page questionnaire was sent to the U.S. headquarters of 267 American firms reported to be doing business abroad. Firms were selected at random from a master list of over 500 companies likely to be involved in language training and represented 28 different types of businesses.[2] A total of 184 questionnaires (68.9 percent) was returned, of which 129 (48.3 percent) were completed either fully or partially, and the other 55 were returned with reasons indicated for non-response.

The present paper is a revised version of the original study. It highlights those aspects of the study that are of particular interest to foreign and second language educators and presents some new insights into the nature of the language needs of U.S. corporations doing business abroad.

LANGUAGE TRAINING FOR AMERICAN EXPATRIATES

Language Ability as a Criterion for Selection

The importance of language and cultural training and orientation for American managers embarking on overseas assignments has been recognized for some time by international management publications and journals and, to some extent, by companies themselves. Yet language ability, as a criterion for selection of personnel for overseas assignments, is scarcely considered by companies doing business internationally. The primary criterion is technical ability, followed by the ability to adapt to a new environment and previous overseas experience. Language ability ranked fourth in the present study.

Wilkins and Arnett, in their extensive 1976 report entitled "Languages for the World of Work" (LWOW), found that, in most instances, employees must have excellent technical training and proven success in domestic operations before management will consider sending them abroad. Foreign language skills are placed well below such attributes as technical ability or knowledge of job, leadership ability, past performance, experience, and adaptability of family. A militating factor here is the high cost of relocating an employee and family overseas. Language ability is rarely a consideration for selection, although "in most companies it is regarded as an extremely significant factor in adaptation . . . ." A survey by Abramson (1974) produced the following comment: "We send our people overseas to do a job. We are concerned only that they have the technical skill, because the people they will be working with overseas all speak English."

Foreign language proficiency has virtually no effect on salary increases; in one study only ten percent of the respondents indicated that preference and higher pay are given to applicants with foreign language skills (Alexander 1975). Indeed one respondent noted that "having skills in a foreign language is considered 'an accomplishment.'" In another survey of selected businesses in the Washington, D.C., area, 72 percent of the respondents indicated that their customers use foreign languages, while only 35 percent felt that applicants with foreign language skills are preferable (Coley and Franke 1974). Over half the respondents in Morgenroth, Parks, and Morgenroth's study (1975) indicated that they would require no use of modern foreign languages over the next four years, even though nearly 85 percent of the firms surveyed engage in business abroad. In a study of firms in Illinois (Arnold, Morgenroth, and Morgenroth 1975), 46 percent of the firms that conduct business abroad and/or deal with non-English-speaking people domestically do not employ people who use foreign language skills in the performance of their business responsibilities.

Colquitt et al. (1974) also report the use of language as a criterion for overseas employment selection as falling far below technical or professional ability and the ability to adapt to a new environment. Yet respondents considered language fluency an "important" (second on a five-point scale) hiring criterion for their international operations divisions. One respondent commented, "No chance of a language major going overseas in first five or ten years. Therefore language facility is meaningless if not used immediately." Schwartz, Wilkins, and Bovée, nearly fifty years ago, cited the personnel director of a large international firm:

> A belief that mastery of a foreign language is the first thing looked for in a man being considered for service abroad is perhaps the commonest error made by those seeking to enter American business in foreign fields . . . . The language qualification is the least of those required in a foreign-service recruit (1932:556).

In a study by Hays (1970), U.S. expatriate managers ranked language ability a poor fourth (and last) choice as a determiner of overseas success. In the first three positions were technical

ability, "relation" abilities (getting along with people), and an adaptive and supportive family. While not denying the importance of professional competence, Kolde (1973) cautions against relying too heavily on technical skills. He comments that ". . . dissatisfaction with an expatriate's performance seldom comes from lack of technical expertise. The major source of failure is intercultural contrasts and attendant interpersonal skills."

Ivancevich (1969) found that both international personnel managers and expatriates themselves rated language training as the highest priority for an overseas assignment. Adams (1968), in a study of American business executives in Latin America, found that 18 percent of the total "top personnel" surveyed had received no training or preparation for their foreign assignments, 16 percent had received technical training, 34 percent language training only, and 23 percent language training along with some type of social and cultural training.

Company Language Policy

Howard (1974), in his study of compensation given overseas personnel, reports that "a majority of the responding multinational companies had a language allowance for overseas personnel"; and only eight percent of the companies surveyed in the LWOW study did not give a language-training allowance. Abramson (1974) too found that language instruction was given the most emphasis of all pre-assignment training components. And in the present study, a language proficiency acquired by employees was in most cases provided by the company (57.4 percent). Other means cited were prior school or military training (29.5 percent), previous residence abroad (28.7 percent), and family associations (27.1 percent). Seven percent were required to obtain their own instruction.

Of the types of training employees receive before they are sent abroad, language received the greatest number of responses (55 percent) in the present study (1978a). Following language training were technical training (43 percent), cultural training (38 percent), and managerial training (35 percent). Twenty-one companies (16 percent) indicated that no training is provided in preparation for an overseas assignment. There did not appear to be any significant differences in these responses from one broad overseas operating functional area (i.e., marketing, manufacturing, service, extraction/processing of natural resources, or advising/training a foreign company or government) to another. Table 1 shows the comparison of total responses by percentage to each of the five categories of international operation.

Table 1

Type of Pre-Assignment Training Provided Employees Going Overseas by Type of Overseas Operation

Type of Training	Overall Percent[a]	Marketing	Manufacturing	Service	Natural Resources[b]	Advise/Train[b]
Language	55	65	71	53	39	40
Cultural	38	43	43	34	48	20
Technical	43	45	40	47	17	20
Managerial	35	35	31	38	26	0
None	16	11	7	7	30	20

[a]Multiple responses account for totals greater than 100.

[b]Percentages are affected by smaller numbers of respondents in these two categories: 23 in Natural Resources and 5 in Advising/Training a Foreign Company or Government.

Despite this apparent commitment to language training, however, only a few companies indicated that their language policies included a required foreign language proficiency. The majority stated that it was "desirable but optional" or that there was no official policy, or simply that it was not required (Table 2). One company indicated that its management had discontinued the dissemination of an official policy statement on foreign language-training allowances for employees on expatriate assignment. This decision was based on "an experience pattern that indicates limited benefit and usage from the allowance." A number pointed out that language training is governed by local option at various sites; one company elaborated that "such training at present is extremely limited."

Language training is ordinarily viewed as a pre-assignment benefit, attendance is usually voluntary, programs are left to individuals themselves to arrange, and the amount of time available for training is severely limited. According to Ivancevich (1969), the time span between selection for overseas assignment and actual departure is three months or less. Clearly no great amount of training can be accomplished in this time period, especially considering the many other demands an individual has on his or her time--both business and personal--in the short time before relocating. In view of Dickerman's recommendation ("Allow Two Years . . ." 1966) of at least a two-year lead time for foreign businessmen coming to the United States, three months seems hardly adequate.

Table 2

Company Language Policy

Classifications of Employees	Foreign Language Proficiency							
	Required		Not Required		Desirable but Optional		No Official Policy	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
All employees	10	7.8	22	17.1	37	28.7	32	24.8
Key personnel (upper level management)	18	14	18	14	48	37.2	17	13.2
Middle management	13	10.1	14	10.9	48	37.2	16	12.4
Technicians[a]	4	3.1	17	13.2	37	28.7	20	15.5
Instructors[a]	9	7	11	8.5	22	17.1	20	15.5
Clerical, administrative personnel[a]	3	2.3	13	10.1	21	16.3	19	14.7

[a]A number of respondents commented that these classifications of employees are not sent overseas; hence the smaller numbers.

A Carnegie study in 1957 indicated that whatever pre-assignment training was provided was generally "Berlitz-type language instruction" or an orientation to company policies and procedures. Seventeen years later, another survey indicated that

> while 77 percent of these firms [i.e., those that regularly assign employees to overseas positions] provide some kind of special training or education for U.S. citizens who are to be stationed overseas, few provide more than some rudimentary opportunities to learn a little of the language and the culture of the nation being visited (Abramson 1974:25).

This 77 percent further breaks down into 40 percent that "regularly provide special training or education of some kind, while another 37 percent provide training 'sometimes.'"

Adams (1968) found that "the length and quality of this training [for overseas assignment] varies considerably, but generally it lacks thoroughness and is of too short duration to be effective." Moreover, "most of the firms which encourage this language preparation permit the individual man to choose his own language course. The six-week Berlitz program is most popular."

The actual amount of language instruction provided to employees is generally in the range of 100 to 120 hours. A number of respondents to the present study commented that the amount of training depends on the individual, the proficiency level he or she is expected to attain, the language being studied, and the amount of time left before departure. One responded, "Whatever amount is necessary, up to 100 hours." Overall, training appears to be of about 100 hours' duration and spread over four to eight weeks. This training period is approximately equivalent to one year of college foreign language study--hardly adequate to operate at any

but the most elementary level. Clearly the aim of this instruction is to provide only the most basic survival level capability to ease the initial shock of being transplanted to a foreign culture; all substantive matters (i.e., those relating to the job) will be handled in English.

By contrast, the Defense Language Institute and the Foreign Service Institute, charged with providing language training to most American military and diplomatic personnel, hold the majority of their courses for 4 to 6 hours a day, 5 days a week, and from 24 to 47 weeks in duration. Even the shortest of these courses features approximately 500 contact hours. A set of guidelines for the selection of English language training suggest a minimum of 840 hours (20 hours a week for 42 weeks) to prepare individuals to receive university or occupational instruction in English.[3] Indeed, according to Carroll (1967), most college graduates with a major in a foreign language score approximately an S-2 rating on the FSI scale, although a 3 rating is required for "Minimum Professional Proficiency."[4] One hundred hours, therefore, cannot be expected to qualify an individual for even a 1 (survival) level. Arnett (1975b) comments that "there is a certain amount of naïveté among some of the company respondents who demonstrate belief in the instant two-week crash course that all language professionals know is a fraudulent concept." Instead of planning ahead for language needs, companies all too often resort to the commercial school "quick fix" or instruct their employees to "pick it up" in the new assignment.

American companies are not unique in their language-training policies. Fitzjohn (1974), writing of English firms, notes that companies often feel that a 20- or 30-hour language course will make the students "fluent" and will give them a "thorough knowledge of business and commercial usage." He continues, "When we try to point out that this aim is too ambitious, we get the reply, 'but I thought you had one of these language labs.'" Emmans, Hawkins, and Westoby (1974), in their survey of English firms, found that less than half provided either in-house or commercially contracted foreign language training for their employees.

The way in which companies "provide" instruction for their employees is largely by contract with a commercial language-teaching organization such as Berlitz or Inlingua (59.7 percent), or with a school or university (8.5 percent) (see Table 3). The demand for training within the company is insufficient or too irregular to require a training staff in-house, although several firms reported having employees charged with language-training coordination, and at least ten percent of the responding firms conduct language training in-house. Training generally takes place within the United States, although training might begin in the U.S. and then be continued in the country of assignment. One person felt that overseas training was "cheaper and better" than that available in the United States. Language training generally takes place at the premises of the contractor, and it ordinarily is conducted during regular working hours rather than on the employees' own time.

Special purpose language training (LSP)[5] is rarely included in corporate-sponsored language-training programs, either because of the heavy use of English in the international business environment or because of the belief that special purpose language training is little more than specialized vocabulary lists of highly technical and highly specific terms. One can only speculate as to the effects on motivation, interest, and success that LSP might have on language courses for businesspeople (cf. Strevens 1971).

Table 3

Number of Companies Contacting Language Organizations, Associations

Association, Organization	Number of Companies
Berlitz	71
American Graduate School of International Management (Thunderbird)	19
Inlingua	18
Business Council for International Understanding	10
Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL)	7
Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL)	6
National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA)	5
Modern Language Association (MLA)	4
American Translators' Association (ATA)	4
American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL)	3
The British Council	2

Of those languages most studied by employees, Spanish was ranked as the most popular. Others ranking high on the list were French, Arabic, Portuguese, and German, followed by Persian, Japanese, Greek, and Russian. Italian, Dutch, and Indonesian were each specified by several firms as "other" languages studied. Spanish is also the foreign language with the highest enrollments in American schools and universities and the native language of the largest linguistic minority in the United States, which could also account for its popularity among businesspeople.

Most companies felt that a foreign language proficiency for their U.S. national employees is more important in some areas of the world than others. Central and South America were ranked first, followed by the Middle East and Western Europe. Those areas where a foreign language proficiency was accorded less importance included the Far East, Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, Africa, Canada, and India. Not surprisingly, these areas correlate quite closely with the languages currently most studied by employees, but less so with the primary locations of overseas business. No doubt the high ranking of Western Europe and Canada as locations of overseas business accounts in large part for the lack of correlation.

Even the U.S. Department of Commerce, one of whose tasks is to promote American business abroad, concerns itself only minimally with the question of language in international marketing. Its pamphlet "How to Get the Most From Overseas Exhibitions" (one of several pamphlets and brochures that form the Department's "Exporter's Kit") recommends that the seller "leap the language barrier":

> Project literature, catalogs, and promotional material are most effective in the local language. If full translation is not possible or too expensive, translate a short synopsis describing your company and its products, especially those on display. If you already have a representative, this is an area he is best qualified to handle.[6]

Several pages later, the same pamphlet emphasizes that registration cards for visitors to an exhibit booth be in the local language. The Department's "A Basic Guide to Exporting" suggests, in Section III, "Communicating Overseas," that one should "answer overseas inquiries promptly and in the language of the letter of inquiry, when requested." The "Checklist for Telephones" in the same section recommends that "annoying expressions" be avoided. "Remember, your party may not be familiar with our slang or expressions."

Wilkins and Arnett (1976) report that representatives of the Bureau of International Commerce "feel that ability in a foreign language represents a major asset for companies wishing to deal in international trade," although English is generally felt to be the lingua franca of business. "Country marketing managers," assisted by "country marketing specialists," operate in 80 to 90 countries; "the Office [of International Marketing] is beginning to insist that all Latin American specialists and all European specialists (excluding Scandinavia) have language proficiency." Except for the positions requiring a language proficiency, the Department's philosophy, while not overtly stated, appears, not surprisingly, to be quite in accord with that of individual companies: language skills or competencies are bought as the need arises and otherwise are not a major corporate concern.

Company Cultural Policy

The importance of cultural factors in overseas training programs must not be excluded, either. All too often the businessperson overseas assumes that the entire world operates according to the values and principles of his or her own culture. Ricks, Fu, and Arpan (1974) cite a number of serious business "blunders" that could and should have been avoided with better planning and cultural sensitivity, empathy, and astuteness. Over and over, misunderstandings and misinterpretations of the language and culture of others are followed to their disastrous conclusions. They state quite frankly that "unicultural managements making all the decisions . . . in different environments seems a high-risk strategy."

A 1972 report in Commerce Today (Feb. 21) indicates that "a third of North American executives working abroad return home before completing their assignments" and that "four out of five foreign representatives in Japan don't complete their missions." Reschke (1977) reports that Coca-Cola Japan no longer will hire any American for a management position. Attendance at a cross-cultural training institute, on the other hand, is claimed to reduce the overseas failure rate to ten to fifteen percent (Lloyd 1972). A recent attempt to offer some insight into cross-cultural matters is described in the article "Japanese Managers Tell How Their System Works" (1977). In the preface the editors explain that "Fortune invited them as individuals, as businessmen who could speak English and who had been abroad enough to be able to see the Japanese business system in perspective." It is frankly difficult to imagine a group of American executives invited by a Japanese publication to discuss in Japanese "how their system works"!

Some companies do offer cultural training to their employees before sending them abroad, but information as to employee participation and overall effectiveness is not readily available. Attendance is frequently optional, indicating, as in language training, that it does not really figure significantly in the corporation's priorities. A variety of techniques for imparting cultural training is, of course, available to the course designer, with simulation and role playing appearing to be among the more promising. Wines (1973) reports the use of trained actors as "adversaries" in negotiations training at the Business Council for International Understanding, and Long (1976) stresses the need to place adult language learners in problem-solving situations where the bridging of an "information gap" will require the communicative use of the target language.

Wilkins and Arnett (1976) point out that there are psychological tests available to determine ethnocentricity and attitudes toward other cultures and people. They conclude, however, that "obviously, they are not being used in selecting overseas personnel." Robinson (1973) reports that such testing has not proven very helpful, even though limited data indicate that high ethnocentrism appears to be associated with overseas job failure. Language aptitude tests, too, can help predict success in foreign language study ("Notes for . . ." 1971). One company in the present study justified not testing employees for language aptitude since "the language factor is not a condition or assignment." Since neither language ability (either present or potential, presumably) nor cultural empathy is virtually ever used as a criterion for selection for overseas employment, however, reliance on these types of assessments seems unlikely to develop.

The Use of Local Nationals

In order to try to solve their language and cultural problems, many companies make extensive use of foreign national agents or employees who control English as well as local languages. Colquitt et al. (1974) found that nearly 98 percent of their respondents would prefer to hire foreign nationals with an MBA degree from a U.S. university for their foreign operations. Wilkins and Arnett (1976) point out that many American companies conduct their international business through a local agent, thereby hoping to circumvent cross-cultural problems. Emmans, Hawkins, and Westoby (1974) found that over 80 percent of their responding firms used agents for at least some of their sales to non-English-speaking countries. In other cases, as a respondent to the LWOW survey commented, "Most of our American technicians, we find, are not capable of adding language skills at the present time, so we have to send them out [to the overseas location] and then use local interpreters."

Robinson (1973) reports that the reasons often cited for the trend of operating overseas with fewer U.S. nationals and more local nationals are lower cost and more intimate "environmental" knowledge. Of course it is true that foreign nationals in overseas operations are not always employed only to solve the language problem, but rather to comply with legal or contractual stipulations imposed by the host government. Oates (1973) cites the example of a Danish firm, the East Asiatic Company, which employs in Nigeria approximately 2500 Nigerians and only 40 to 50 Danes. Still the board chairman "admits that having a nucleus of Danes the company can rely on in the top posts 'means we can sleep soundly at night here in Denmark.'" Nonetheless it is a company noted for its rigid training and selection procedures with emphasis on quality proficiency in languages. As its management aptly points out, "an employee speaking a foreigner's language poorly may insult or alienate him rather than use the native language as an advantage, particularly where the native is more proficient in the language of the company's officers."

English: The International Business Language

The majority of international business dealings in which American companies are involved are conducted in English. Only 17 percent of the companies in the present study responded that Americans speak foreign languages in the United States in an international situation, and only 35.7 percent do so abroad. Most companies (73.6 percent) reported that their foreign contacts and representatives speak English in the United States business environment, and 79 percent reported that they use English abroad. Companies also reported minimal use of interpreters. Several mentioned that bilingual or multilingual secretaries handled non-English matters. The highly dispersed nature of corporate operations and the high mobility of American expatriates also contribute to the "English-only" syndrome. Some companies have also indicated that they automatically expect English to be used as the common language when dealing with people whose native language is other than English.

Although the position of English as the most widely spoken language in the world (if one includes both its native and non-native speakers) and its intimate link with science and technology, big business, and economic power cannot be denied, a monolithic insistence on its exclusive use in international trade and business seems ignorant and imperialistic. As Crispin points out,

> Even though English is the international business language, those businessmen for whom it is not their native tongue seem to put an extra effort and enthusiasm into conducting or concluding business where the conversation is in their native language . . . (1974:50).

One can but speculate as to the extent to which a company's business could be improved or its image (as well as that of the United States itself) enhanced if local languages were used and appreciated more by Americans overseas, particularly now that the United States has sizable and significant competition on the international scene. Several respondents observed that, ideally, "we would speak the local language." One pointed out, however, that "it is a rare occasion when professional capability, language capability, and a job assignment all come together at the same time." Crispin gives an enthusiastic testimonial of a foreign language capability in business, as do a number of the other LWOW study respondents:

> . . . our own study evoked commentaries, case studies, and data from a number of what might be considered highly enlightened officials who reported unusual success in profits, in public relations, and in total operations which they attributed to their attention to language and cultural training . . . . There is considerable evidence in the literature and in the studies that have been performed by international business experts that this attitude [insisting on English as the operating language] is detrimental to the overall operating potential of American businesses abroad and for firms in the U.S. doing foreign business (Arnett 1976:15-16).

A survey of Indiana firms revealed that only "half of them [the respondents] are aware of potential improvements [of their business] through more extensive use of foreign languages" (Gouvernayre and Lauvergeon 1974). The authors further point out that "the low demand for Arabic is one example of the linguistic barriers on the trade opportunity" and that "the lack of people fluent in Arabic prevents complete market penetration." Winter (1968) recounts that a native of a Middle Eastern country expressed amazement that Americans would attempt to enter into the affairs of that complex region without a knowledge of Arabic. Admitting that it is one of the most difficult languages to learn (for native speakers of English, presumably!), he added that "the Russians who are here speak Arabic fluently."

This insistence on letting the other party bridge the language gap has been summed up by Galbraith (1978) as "our congenital inadequacy in languages." Since non-English speakers have no greater inherent aptitude for languages than English speakers do, the problem is clearly one of attitude and motivation. Schumann (1976) discusses social and psychological distance, including temporary nature of the assignment, as factors that are detrimental to second language acquisition. Aitken (1973) adds that when the assignment is regarded as temporary, "there becomes little point in learning the language, so one seeks helpers who know it--and becomes dependent on them." Kolde (1974) states that ". . . lack of linguistic facility remains a critical blindspot in American managerial preparedness for effective multinational communications . . . . Other people's knowledge of English is not a substitute for our own linguistic ability." Phatak (1974) and Kolde speak of three levels of corporate awareness of linguistic and cultural sensitivity in international business: ethnocentrism (linguistic and cultural chauvinism), polycentrism, and geocentrism ("cosmopolitan corporate structure"). Kolde (1974:147-48)* elaborates on corporate ethnocentrism in the following lengthy passage:

> Nothing can be communicated [within the particular company] that is not in English. This subjects all transboundary communication of the firm to the tyranny of ignorance. It isolates the headquarters executives from the realities of affiliate companies, and retards the development of company-oriented constructive attitudes and personal loyalties among the indigenous personnel. Most companies exhibit agitated sensitivity on the language problem, but we found none [emphasis in original] that has taken decisive action to correct the deficiency in their managerial cadre.
>
> A few companies are actually trying to correct the situation by subsidizing language study for executives. The typical arrangement covers the tuition and fees of an approved language program, and may also permit some company time to be used for attending the course. Both the coverage and intensity are left to the individual, and there is no concrete incentive for anyone to participate in the program. As a result, the more ambitious executives find more promising alternatives for their self-improvement endeavors.
>
> Executives who do invest enough time in language study to become proficient find themselves rewarded with reassignment to the outposts, mostly in sales or procurement, where direct communication with local nationals is a critical necessity. Too often these are dead-end jobs from which there is no access for further advancement. Thus what appears initially as a promotion may in a longer perspective turn out to

*Reprinted by permission of the publisher, from E.J. Kolde, THE MULTINATIONAL COMPANY: BEHAVIORAL AND MANAGERIAL ANALYSES. (Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, D.C. Heath and Company, Copyright 1974, D.C. Heath and Company.)

have been tantamount to reclassification from a regular executive career path to that of a technician or limited-function specialist. All in all, progress through these programs remains invisible to this observer.

A somewhat larger minority of U.S. companies seeks to remedy the language problem by employing multilingual foreign nationals to serve in crucial buffer positions between the parent company and the affiliates. This is self-deception. The multilingual foreigners are rarely endowed with any real executive authority, but serve more or less as errand boys for the headquarters people. Their contribution is limited mostly to routine communication problems. There is reason to suspect that at times they may even serve as amplifiers of the ethnocentric influences of the headquarters executives upon whom they so completely depend.

The large majority of U.S.-based multinational firms seems to believe that the problem will resolve itself. Their management, taking its cues from the traditional business school curriculum, refrains from any move to face the problem.

Finally, there is an indeterminable number of companies where the managerial cadre puts a negative value on language knowledge. Acquisition of language facility thus becomes an impediment for an executive's international career. This kind of cultural perversion seems to derive from the chauvinistic fear that language knowledge renders one susceptible to unwanted and potentially dangerous foreign influences, which may induce the executive to "go native," that is, to lose his usefulness completely to the company. Viewed through an ethnocentric tunnel, it is better to remove such potential subversives from the seats of corporate power.

A majority of companies in the present study (62.8 percent) felt that the international aspects of their companies' business were not hindered by language problems. Less than one-third (27.9 percent) responded that their international business did suffer from language problems; 2.3 percent felt they did not know (a supplied answer); and 7 percent did not respond. Many commented, however, that communication is not precise, that details and nuances of meaning are missed even though all parties think they understand each other, and that their business and daily operations could be improved with greater language capabilities. Several observed that the language problem means that more time is required for negotiations and business dealings, and that efficiency suffers as a result. Others mentioned the difficulty in establishing rapport and a "limited opportunity to entertain and socialize." Several pointed out the difficulty of locating a general manager candidate with a foreign language proficiency, as well as the need for employees with "more foreign technical language capability." One respondent observed that "each year the problem is less and less, as more foreign nationals become more capable in English." Yet to train Americans adequately to deal in a foreign language and a foreign culture would require more time, money, and effort than most corporations or individuals are apparently willing to expend.

* * *

The overall picture of American corporate employees' foreign language ability overseas is not always encouraging, and it seems unlikely to change as long as companies feel that their penetration of foreign markets and their profits from overseas operations are adequate. These almost universal policies in the business world are undoubtedly dictated by the need for expediency and cost-effectiveness. The desire to "get the job done" in the shortest time and at the least cost leads to the hiring of those with ready skills, such as the translator, the interpreter, or the foreign employee or agent who speaks English.

No amount of exhortation as to the benefits, tangible or intangible, of adequate language and cross-cultural training is apt to cause companies to alter their course of action as long as there is sufficient demand for U.S. firms' goods and services. Faced with serious competition, however, companies may be forced to change, as exemplified by the case of this American executive in Europe:

> After living seven years in a French-speaking community, he was unable to say or understand "bonjour," and his superior and indifferent attitude antagonized the distributors. The initial successes can be traced to the strength of the product itself and the lack of competition. Once competition appeared, immediately the U.S. manufacturer suffered; even though the new competitive product was not superior, the obliging and positive business attitude of the competitor literally won over the distributors and swept the market (Vogel 1968:59).

The corporate view of foreign language capability and training seems to be essentially that they are commodities to be purchased as needed but that otherwise they do not merit having undue time or attention spent on them. As a commodity, though, language training should be subject to the same rigorous evaluation standards and monitoring criteria as are other phases of companies' contracted or subcontracted operations. To assume that language training is only an incidental component of an overseas venture is very risky and can lead to the waste of untold amounts of time and money.

An alternate view may, however, be emerging, thanks to the development of non-traditional foreign language curricula and their inclusion in interdisciplinary programs (see full discussion below). This change in focus meshes directly with the business perspective of a foreign language skill as a tool to be used in addition to the "hard" skills of the business or technical world. By preparing prospective managers to be proficient in a language (or languages) other than their own and attuned to differences in cultures and traditional business practices besides, foreign language departments can provide a real service to the business and international communities. Generally speaking, corporations view the language preparation that is presently provided by American schools and colleges to their employees as poor in terms of meeting the requirements of the business world, and they would welcome a shift in emphasis from a predominantly literary orientation to one more immediately applicable to students' professions and careers. The appearance in increasing numbers of the dually trained businessperson may lead to a far more positive American presence overseas and to a significant modification of the lip service that most firms appear to be paying to the need for language and cultural training.

LANGUAGE TRAINING FOR NON-U.S. NATIONAL EMPLOYEES

There appears to be a far greater corporate commitment in terms of time and money to language training for non-U.S. national (i.e., non-English-speaking) employees than for U.S. nationals, even though not as many companies are involved in it. In light of the fact that English is the predominant language of business around the world, a significant English language-training effort by American corporations should not really be surprising. In general, nationals of countries other than the United States seem to undergo far more rigorous and thorough preparation for assignments of an international nature, including those in their own countries. Foreign languages are studied seriously throughout the educational process so that true bi- or multi-lingualism becomes a reality. In Japan, for example, some companies provide a period of intensive "remedial" English training along with in-depth cultural training for individuals engaged in international business. Others contract with private institutions, often located in the United States, to offer this training. Clearly a radically different philosophy pervades the entire society--from its educational system to its business institutions.

In many cases language training has been deemed necessary because of technical or vocational training provided by the company in a language foreign to local national employees (generally English). A majority of companies in the present study (59.7 percent) reported that they conduct vocational or technical training programs for non-U.S. national employees as part of their overseas operations. Generally speaking, at least half the responding companies in each category of company reported that technical or vocational training is provided to their non-U.S. national employees in many countries throughout the world. The primary language of instruction of technical/vocational training was reported to be English for two categories of instructor (U.S. nationals and third country nationals), although the number of local nationals teaching technical/vocational subjects in the native language of the students (and their own native language, too, of course) outranked the number of local nationals teaching in English.

The most frequently cited reason for conducting technical/vocational training in English was that since English is the corporate language, all company business is done in English. Other reasons reported were that all technical and training materials are in English and that equivalent technical terminology often does not exist in other languages. Further, because in some fields (aviation, for example) English is the international language of communication, training individuals to handle job-related materials and communication directly in the source language is definitely more efficient and cost-effective than attempting to translate massive amounts of printed matter or to train sufficient numbers of host country nationals and/or U.S. nationals to provide technical training in the host country language. Not only is the translation/training effort itself a monumental and almost impossible task, but in addition it often requires the creation or borrowing of a new lexicon and totally new concepts in the trainees' native language. Other justifications given were that the instructors do not know the foreign language and that instruction in English is a foreign government or contractual requirement, since a knowledge of English can serve to enhance an employee's career potential. The predominant reason given for conducting training in the students' native language was that it is, after all, the students' native language and therefore the medium through which they can most readily receive and process information.

Companies were almost evenly divided as to whether or not they provide language training to non-U.S. national employees or trainees: 42 percent responded affirmatively, and almost 46 percent responded negatively. Of the companies reporting that they provide technical/vocational training, 57 percent also provide language training, although the language training is not necessarily a component of the technical training phase of employee development. In all but three cases, English was the language specified in which language training was provided.

Most of the personnel being trained are employees of the corporation itself, with only a few employed by a host nation firm or by the host government. A broader spectrum of employees receives language training overseas than in the United States, too: in general, U.S. nationals sent abroad are limited to middle and upper level management, while in the host country itself, technicians, laborers, and clerical and administrative personnel are also candidates for training.

In most cases an individual's job determines whether or not he or she will be selected to receive language training. In most cases, too, language training and vocational/technical training are considered as separate entities, either conducted simultaneously or sequentially, with language training preceding technical/vocational training. Training is most often conducted in the foreign country itself. Language training is generally performed under contract with a commercial language-teaching organization, as it is for U.S. national employees, although respondents supplied the names of more contractors than they did when asked about training U.S. national employees. The second most frequent means of providing language training was to conduct it in-house, using company language-teaching employees as instructors. In general, when language training is conducted under contract, the amount and types of training to be provided are specified in the contract. The reasons for dealing with more than one contractor (as slightly more than half the respondents reported) ranged from maintaining a competitive spirit among contractors, to having varying requirements at different times, to having too many students for a single contractor to handle.

The type of language taught in these company-sponsored programs is both general and specialized. Although special purpose language instruction appears to be more prevalent in these training programs than in those for Americans going overseas, there is a lack of awareness of the value of LSP training and of its implementation in actual programs. This same lack of awareness is evident in determining the content of language training: ranking highest were the individual skills (i.e., reading, speaking, understanding, and writing) required on the job and the level of proficiency acceptable or required (17 percent each). The professional level of a person's job ranked third (11 percent), and the functional area of a particular job ranked fourth with only 7 percent.

Language teachers in these programs (specifically, English teachers) tend to be trained English teachers--not necessarily native speakers of English--with no particular technical expertise, and hired locally. The next most frequently hired type of instructor is a trained English teacher, a native speaker of English with no particular technical expertise, hired in the United States and sent abroad. Most companies indicated that a teacher-training program is not a component of their (or their contractors') training programs.

Instructional materials are most often chosen from readily available commercial texts, although it is also common to have individual teachers assemble or develop materials as needed. A few companies indicated that the materials had been custom tailored for their programs by materials development experts.

Respondents were almost evenly divided as to whether students are tested to determine their entry level qualifications, with slightly more responding no than yes. The most common means of evaluating students' attained proficiency is on-the-job performance, but interviews and test scores are also used to some extent.

In general, the length of training time indicated by respondents was considerably longer than that reported for Americans going abroad. Periods of 6, 12, and even 24 months are apparently not uncommon. Company policy appears, then, to be one essentially of lip service to a foreign language capability for American personnel going overseas but to a genuine commitment to it for local national employees.

The responses on teacher-student class ratio indicate, as expected, a formal classroom arrangement: approximately one-third of those companies responding checked 1:10 and 1:5 (each), and just under one-third checked 1:1. This is in sharp contrast to the largely ad hoc and 1:1 teaching arrangements reported in foreign language training for U.S. national employees.

Very few companies (11 percent) indicated that they had attempted to limit or simplify the language of technical materials that non-U.S. national employees must use. Of those who had tried it, most felt that it had been successful. Those who had not tried it felt that it would be too costly, that there was no company support for it, or that they were not interested in "creating the wheel twice."

Most respondents felt that they had experienced no significant problems with their overseas language-training programs, although many declined to answer this question. Several felt that there was not enough time overall, in terms of months or weeks, allocated to language training. Interestingly enough, and perhaps most revealing of all, 64 percent of the respondents to the question on the role that language training had played in planning their company's overseas

operations checked "None," with no significant differences among overseas functional area groups. Perhaps if language training had been included in the planning stages of the overseas venture, the insufficient time allowed for training would not have been a problem.

* * *

Language training for non-U.S. national employees translates almost always to English language training. Many U.S. corporations are deeply involved in and heavily committed to such training to a much greater extent than to foreign language training for their U.S. national employees. Training periods of several months or even a year or more are not uncommon. A greater English language proficiency is required of non-U.S. nationals than a foreign language proficiency is of U.S. nationals because English is needed for the individual's job or for a period of pre-employment training or retraining.

Despite this greater overall commitment, however, English language training is still regarded by the parent corporation essentially as a commodity to be purchased as the need arises--in most cases instruction is contracted with a language-teaching organization or institution, and companies indicate overwhelmingly that language training has played no role in the planning of their overseas operations.

TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETING IN THE BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT

Translation

The importance of English in technical literature gives the English-speaking scientist a feeling of superiority and even false security. Although one-half of the literature of many technical fields is published in English, the other half, obviously, appears in other languages. Chan (1976) and Kertesz (1974), moreover, predict that English-speaking scientists will probably read very little of the non-English material.

The area of translating and interpreting in the corporate environment, therefore, is one that deserves greater attention than it currently is accorded. Kertesz, discussing language training--particularly translation skills--for American scientists, suggests that

> . . . a scientist or engineer with practical research or plant experience who exhibits linguistic ability and interest would probably be a safer choice for a technical translator than a graduate of humanistic courses with diplomas attesting to his mastery of several languages (1974:97).

He feels that it is simpler "to give an engineer a language than a linguist engineering competence," which is precisely the position of the U.S. government in maintaining its several large language-training institutions (Weinstein 1975). Again, because of sporadic need, Kertesz feels that one full-time technical translator in a large laboratory is sufficient, "supplemented by those [skills] of other employees whose linguistic experience is utilized in order to minimize the cost." He also advocates use of a reliable professional translation service for problems that cannot readily be handled in-house. Gingold (1966) suggests solving the translation problem by using a staff translator, a translator hired on a per diem basis, or a translation bureau or free-lance individual.

Translation is a significant undertaking in many scientific or research-oriented firms. One private translation firm in New York in 1973 had revenues of nearly $10 million ("The Corporate Word . . ." 1974). The staff, numbering over two hundred, are of course equipped with a professional specialty--law, accounting, or chemistry, for example--in addition to language skills. Brawley (1969) also points out that the technical translator in industry must be a fully trained scientist or technician who has a thorough knowledge of the source language but who should always translate into his native language.

Even though translation skills are perhaps the most eminently hirable among required foreign language capabilities, being almost quantifiable, as it were (or at least more tangible in that specific tasks can be defined--see Tinsley 1973), translation requirements still appear for the most part to be handled virtually on an ad hoc basis. According to several surveys of language requirements of American business and service organizations, translation of foreign language texts or documents appears to be one of the main foreign language-oriented requirements of these firms. In the present study, the greatest translation need (56.6 percent) was in translating correspondence from a foreign language into English. Promotional literature and advertising from English into a foreign language ranked second overall (36.4 percent]--not surprising in view of the dominance of marketing in companies' reported overseas operations. Following those two categories were correspondence from English into a foreign language, brochures and technical manuals from English into a foreign language, and instructional materials from English into a foreign language (each 32.6 percent). Just over 11 percent reported that they had no need for translation at all.

The studies show that translation and interpreting needs are met, in general, by company employees whose main job is in a non-language area, illustrating the employability of the "language-plus" trained person. When company employees themselves are not able to handle the translation, firms look to outside translation agencies, instructors at nearby schools and colleges, other firms such as banks, residents of the local community, or simply "friends." Very few retain full-time translators. Table 4 shows in detail how companies handle their translation and interpreting requirements.

Table 4

Means by Which Translation and Interpreting Requirements Are Met

Translation	Percent	Interpreting	Percent
Company employees, main job non-language	40.3	Company employees, main job non-language	38.8
Commercial agency	34.1	Private professional interpreter	12.4
Company employees, main job language area	24.0	Company employees, main job language area	11.6
Private professional translator	15.5	Commercial agency	11.6
Private individual	10.9	Private individual	11.6
Provided by other party	5.4	Provided by other party	7.0
School or university	3.1	School or university	0.8

All too often, however, an ability to translate effectively is equated with a knowledge of a foreign language, when actually translation requires a number of highly specialized skills. Alexander notes a decided disadvantage to relying on outside translators:

> . . . those arrangements with persons who treat translation for business as a secondary matter would not generally give the immediacy of response or the desired business insights that employees of the firm itself would be able to give as a matter of course (1975:35).

Beeth (1973) points out that a cultural translator is needed--one who knows more than the languages in question. Kolde (1974) observes that the tendency to use literal translation has been a basic weakness in international managerial communication. He feels that the traditional methods of language instruction probably contribute to this trend, as well as the relative unsophistication of American executives in language matters. The emphasis, therefore, is on language as a vehicle for transmitting accurate information rather than as an art of literary expression. Indeed, Ricks, Fu, and Arpan (1974) cite innumerable examples of marketing disasters when translations have been too literal and have been done without regard for social, psychological, and cultural appropriateness. Many American products have been failures abroad because of the assumption that the American cultural set prevails world-wide. Product names have frequently had to be changed in various places around the world because of phonological or semantic anomalies, or proximity to taboo terms in certain languages.

A problem, however, exists with regard to the translation of scientific or technical material. Often new vocabulary must be created or, more commonly, borrowed from the language in which it originated. Then, too, whether the vocabulary exists or not, simply keeping up with the volumes of materials steadily produced is a virtual impossibility. Textbooks and manuals are often outdated or obsolete by the time they are translated. For this reason, then, a world language (now generally English) is frequently established as a more or less official second language in countries whose own national language (or languages) is (are) used but sparingly outside their own citizenry. Higher education is often presented through this second language (to maintain an educational support system of libraries, textbooks, and reference works in the vernacular is unrealistic), and foreign contractors or employers often conduct occupational training through that language. Extensive language-training programs are also necessary in

such cases. Further, where individuals of a number of different language backgrounds must communicate, a "language of wider communication" (but not always necessarily English) is almost a necessity. As an American contractor working in Saudi Arabia recently commented:

> Communicating is one of our biggest problems--Saudis talking to Americans who are talking to Koreans who work alongside Filipinos and Malaysians on a job designed by Germans with British surveyors. Some of these people don't even like each other. It's a nightmare (Azzi 1978:111).

Interpreting

Most respondents in the present study reported that they had no need for interpreters (nearly 35 percent); 24 percent stated that interpreters were needed both overseas and in the United States; 22.5 percent, overseas only; and 7 percent, in the United States only. This lack of need was attributed by 52.7 percent of the companies to all parties' speaking English (only 17.8 percent reported that none were needed because all spoke the foreign language). Where interpreters were needed, they were required primarily for matters involving professional and technical uses of language (43.4 percent) and for top-level negotiations (27.9 percent). Only 16.3 percent reported a need in daily operations, and 11.6 percent for social and conversational needs.

Beeth (1973) recommends that, when necessary, one "get the best interpreter available . . . . In important negotiations you should hire the interpreter, rather than let the other party do it." He stresses the need for developing a spirit of cooperation and loyalty in international dealings, which, he says, is not always attainable if the other party is in control.

Stebinger (1975), while a strong advocate of the use of foreign languages among Americans overseas and himself involved with the Master's Program in International Business Studies at the University of South Carolina, which features an overseas practicum, nonetheless recognizes the difficulty of becoming truly fluent in another language: "True bilingualism is, in my view, needed before you can handle, in a language not your own, the daily chores of top management . . . . When you have to deal with a very complex business question, use your own language or a very, very good interpreter." He feels that for "supervisory and advisory work . . . the use of a foreign language is more necessary and more practical."

Robinson also points out the difficulty of an adult's becoming bilingual and feels that "pride should not stand in the way of employing a good interpreter." He goes on to say that many expatriate managers have been eminently successful by combining the use of competent interpreters with coincidental study of the language to the point of being able to keep the interpreter "on his toes." The pitfall here, unfortunately, is

> the temptation to associate unduly with those speaking one's own language. In many non-Western countries, the U.S. businessman is surrounded by English-speaking "carpetbaggers," many of whom may not be ethnically or culturally part of the major community. He should be wary of becoming too closely involved (1973:267).

The languages most involved in translation and interpreting (Table 5) correspond fairly closely with the languages most studied and with the ranking of countries where companies felt a foreign language proficiency to be important. Again there was no significant correlation with those countries where most of the international business is done. Interestingly, many respondents left this question blank, with several commenting that they had insufficient information to rank, or that no statistics were kept since the matter was not of sufficient priority to their firm.

Only 17 firms (13.2 percent) reported that they employed within the United States persons whose primary job is dealing with foreign language matters; of these, 14 were reported as foreign language experts, and only 3 were reported as experts primarily in technical fields and secondarily in foreign languages. Their proficiency was attributed mainly to their having lived abroad or to their academic training. Personal or family contacts ranked third. This should not be surprising, since an organization that wishes to hire persons skilled in foreign languages will no doubt seek language experts for those positions rather than someone who is primarily skilled in other areas. What is significant is the small number of companies reporting such employees, indicating the extremely limited market for the foreign language major in private industry.

* * *

Translating and interpreting skills appear in many cases in the corporate environment to be ancillary skills; individuals whose job is in a non-language area or who at least possess a combination of language and technical skills are those called upon to serve as translators and interpreters. Rigorous standards are not, however, always applied to translation work, the

Table 5

Languages Involved Most in Translation and Interpreting

Translation		Interpreting	
Language[a]	Position by Average Rank[b]	Language[a]	Position by Average Rank[b]
Spanish	1	Spanish	1
French	2	Persian	2
Persian	3	Arabic	3
Arabic	4	French	3
German	5	Japanese	5
Portuguese	6	German	6
Japanese	7	Portuguese	7
Russian	8	Russian	7

[a]Languages ranked by more than five companies.

[b]Includes rankings from first to fifth place.

assumption presumably being that anyone who "knows" the target language can perform an acceptable translation job.

Although interpreters can be used effectively in international operations and negotiations, exclusive reliance on them is not recommended. The astute businessperson should be sensitive to the importance of empathetic communication and do his or her utmost to project an appropriate image overseas.

Foreign Languages as Ancillary Skills

The overwhelming theme running through all the studies of foreign languages and business is that in the business world, a foreign language capability is strictly an ancillary skill and that there really is not a demand for foreign language majors unless those individuals also possess another "primary" skill to serve as their main occupation. Wilkins and Arnett (1976) found that business administration/management and marketing/sales were rated by responding businesses as those college majors which could best be combined with language skills. In the University of York (England) study,

> the general picture that emerged from the graduates' survey was of foreign language graduates playing only a modest role as foreign language users in industry . . . . Foreign languages, for all except translators and interpreters, were ancillary to the employees' main job and occupied comparatively little of their working week (Emmans, Hawkins, and Westoby 1974:48).

Merklein observes that ". . . there is a great demand for linguistic skills, especially if coupled with a solid business foundation." Further on in this same article, when describing the International MBA program at the University of Dallas, Merklein explains that "our policy is to attract students . . . who already possess fluency in a commercial language." He continues:

> It seemed obvious at the outset that the B.A. holder in foreign languages would be our prime candidate. However, it soon became apparent that most foreign language majors with a B.A. degree are not fluent enough to use their foreign language as a working tool (1975:31).

To rectify this situation, foreign study arrangements have been established whereby courses, not in the foreign language, but in the actual content area (but of course taught through the target language) are offered. Saville-Troike (1974), although writing of ESL training for adults, agrees: "Students with limited competence in English need . . . instruction in English which is directly related to and integrated with English content instruction." She further stresses "the need to teach a second language not by traditional foreign language methods, but by using it to teach something else." McDonald and Sager (1975) likewise feel that "advanced language learning is inseparable from subject study in the foreign language; the teaching of specific disciplines in the foreign language is the cornerstone of all advanced language work."

An informal letter survey of a sample of American businesses, industries, and service organizations, sponsored in 1972 by the Modern Language Association, confirmed the use of foreign languages in business only as a supplementary skill: "The most frequently checked alternative . . . was one indicating that the respondent's organization 'makes occasional use of the foreign language skills of regular staff members who were not hired for this purpose alone'" (Hecker 1973). A businessman speaking to the annual conference of the Ohio Modern Language Teachers Association pointed out that "to do one's job effectively in English and in another language and culture makes one many times more valuable to a corporation." He further stressed the need for teachers to inform their students of the opportunities that exist for the business- and language-trained individual ("Increasing Need . . ." 1978).

Morgenroth, Parks, and Morgenroth (1975), reporting on a study of South Carolina industries as well as of secondary schools and junior and senior colleges in that state, found that "only one of the businesses gives preference in hiring to those . . . with a modern foreign language skill," although "most businesses would like to employ engineering graduates with modern foreign language skills." Other degree areas mentioned for graduates with foreign language skills included management, marketing, and accounting. In a similar study undertaken in Illinois (Arnold, Morgenroth, and Morgenroth 1975), the most frequent means by which firms meet the need for foreign language skills is "occasional use of foreign language skills of staff members who have other normal duties." Only nine percent of the firms employ people who use foreign language skills, however. The most frequently checked source of employees' foreign language skills was "speaking a foreign language at home," not really surprising in view of the multiple ethnicities represented in the Chicago area and the likelihood of Chicago-based firms' dominating the sample.

Terras (1975) surveyed 100 business establishments and government agencies throughout the country, inquiring about the need for employees bilingual in German and English. "The survey makes it obvious that a German major without the acquisition of additional skills has little occupational usefulness outside of teaching." Business, engineering, and economics were the three fields most preferred in combination with German language skills. In the words of one of the respondents: "Language is by itself insufficient . . . . A language adds to, rather than substitutes for, a primary skill in the business world."

All these findings lead inescapably to the conclusion that language is a skill which, when combined with other skills, dramatically increases a person's attractiveness in the job market. As Eddy (1975) states, "One has to know a foreign language in addition to having some subject area expertise." Indeed, "Subject area expertise is more important to the employer than foreign language knowledge."

Responses from the Foreign Language Profession

The implications of the business community's message to the foreign language education profession are increasingly being translated into specialized, non-traditional, and interdisciplinary course offerings. This shift has been spurred, perhaps, less by the desire to accommodate business and industrial concerns than by the absolute necessity of self-preservation in the face of declining enrollments brought about not only by the elimination of foreign language requirements in many colleges and universities, but also by the complaint that traditional foreign language courses are not relevant to the life goals of students.[7]

The inadequacy of, or at least a dissatisfaction with, the foreign language training provided by schools and universities is frequently expressed by both foreign language graduates and employers. Arnett, discussing the LNOW study--in which both the U.S. federal government and private business firms were surveyed to determine the types of jobs for which language skills are required and also to investigate the type of training that each sector makes available to its employees--reports that

> a major finding of the study was that, on the whole, the government is far more efficient in the training of its personnel in foreign languages than are commercial language schools, public schools, junior and senior colleges, and universities. Government training is also generally more efficient than the in-house training conducted by business and industry.

He goes on to comment that

> . . . according to an official GAO [General Accounting Office] report in 1971, the federal government spent more than $60 million on language training. Ironically, most of the personnel who were trained had had previous language training experience in the public schools or universities, yet this training was insufficient to prepare them to perform their tasks. It was not only insufficient but, for the most part, the prior training had been directed toward social intercourse or literature and did not help individuals obtain the technical vocabulary and dependent language skills that would permit more immediate and effective performance of the government job (1976:15).

(A high ranking U.S. government employee in Iran commented to this author, however, that despite having completed a six-month course in Persian at the Foreign Service Institute before moving to Tehran, for official and politically sensitive functions he was still obliged to rely on an interpreter, since the conversational language he had been taught would hardly be appropriate for communicating with others at his social and professional level.)

In the private sector, over 6,000 business firms were surveyed in the LNOW study, although the response rate was only approximately 23 percent. "As in the case of government, business and

industry are more than a little dissatisfied with the products of our schools and universities and the language training afforded the students." Freudenstein (n.d.) feels that industrial foreign language training in Germany is also far superior to that provided by the schools.

The foreign language graduates surveyed in the study conducted by Emmans, Hawkins, and Westoby (1974) in England expressed dissatisfaction with the language training they had received in school. In particular, respondents felt a need for greater emphasis on the spoken language. This emphasis on oral/aural skills correlates closely with a survey conducted in 1972 by the London Chamber of Commerce of the use made of foreign languages by various types of staff--exclusive of language specialists--in business firms (Lee 1977/78). Respondents indicated that listening and speaking were the two skills required most frequently in their work, followed by reading and then writing.

Respondents to the study by Colquitt et al. (1974) also felt that foreign language departments give "poor preparation" (fourth on a five-point scale) to their students; Merklein and Frenk (1974), however, found that 44 percent of undergraduate students in four southern states felt that their foreign language studies offered "good or very good" preparation for a professional career outside of teaching. Senior college respondents in South Carolina generally believe that the emphasis in their language courses "is balanced between developing a working competency and developing literary appreciation" (Morgenroth, Parks, and Morgenroth 1975). The college departments themselves, however, "indicated that they would place greater emphasis upon commercial usage, if the business community wants them to do so." While such a response could easily be merely an artifact of the questionnaire, the attitude seems promising.

Alexander (1975), in his study of Kansas manufacturing firms, also found that respondents felt that "foreign language learning should be practical (less academic), relevant, and thorough . . . . Evidence . . . is pointing to the . . . reality that language training must become more occupationally based, integrated fully with the emerging concept of career education."

The implications of such findings for foreign language curricula in schools and institutions of higher learning seem obvious, and indeed there has been an encouraging trend in recent years to combine career or professional education with foreign language skills, with a view both to international employment and to domestic employment (such as within the United States) where a number of residents are handicapped by limited English language skills.

Walser, one of the foremost proponents of the career education/foreign language concept, has discussed in several publications the need for curriculum modifications. Many other educators have argued for and given compelling examples of the need for foreign language skills as auxiliary skills, have stressed the need for change in foreign language courses and departments, and have emphasized the importance of adequate career counseling for foreign language students. Hayden (1975), reporting on the International Education Project's Task Force on Language, lists a number of their recommendations to improve specialist language training. Of prime concern was not only measurement of proficiency, but also specification of competencies.

Brod (1974) proposes that the collective efforts of the foreign language-teaching profession be channeled into the dimensions of information, public awareness, and curriculum. He feels that foreign language departments are well able to compete with commercial language schools, which have recently been enjoying unprecedented popularity. For a foreign language department, "there is no inherent conflict between its traditional role as inheritor of a humanistic discipline and its eventual new role in the service of a career-oriented market."

Brod further argues that foreign language departments, through traditional and non-traditional courses alike, are far better equipped than commercial schools to teach culture, the need for which, he claims, the international business community is quite aware. Often, however, there appears to be a great distance between "awareness" and actual practice. Potter (1977) and Fiske (1977) have, through newspaper coverage, brought the situation to the attention of a wider and more general audience, and Wilkins et al. (1977) have provided a bibliographical overview of the situation from the perspective of the LWOW study. Rivers (1973), although not describing career-oriented language courses per se, nonetheless argues for meeting students' expressed needs in the foreign language curriculum through both skill specialization (i.e., not necessarily requiring students to master all four skills) and content modification.

Walser (1973), too, on the basis of an HEW feasibility study, concludes that "the goal of a bilingual/bicultural component in a career education program should be to develop foreign language capacity plus a saleable skill." One of the outcomes of the LWOW study was the development of "a model curriculum demonstration unit for each situation, integrating language study with cultural awareness and career objectives" (Arnett 1976).

A number of descriptions of interdisciplinary programs that feature foreign languages as a supplementary skill have appeared recently. Merklein (1974) and Merklein and Cooley (1974) discuss several programs that combine a foreign language with international business, focusing on their own at the University of Dallas. Primeau (1975) identifies thirteen MBA programs

that require one or more languages. Fryer (1975) and Joiner (1975) discuss the M.S. in International Business, offered at the University of South Carolina since 1974, which features some study in a foreign country. Lesley (1975) looks, on the other side of the coin, at an interdisciplinary program for foreign university graduates entering the MBA program at the University of Southern California.

Roessler (1974) discusses the business courses in German offered by the American Graduate School of International Management (formerly the Thunderbird School) and points out the critical need for (and general lack of) good materials for these courses. Slessarev (1974) reviews the International Business option at the University of Cincinnati, which also includes language and cultural studies and a period of study abroad. Frautschi (1978), commenting that "vocational pragmatism has seemingly infected the liberal arts," describes a recently instituted French/business undergraduate major at Pennsylvania State University. Middlebury College has organized a program of "extended majors" that combines study in a "substantive field" with the study of foreign languages. Many of the major field courses are taught in a foreign language rather than in English (Scully 1977). Halvorson, Moniz, and Nathan (1978) discuss the Multinational Corporate Studies (MCS) program at a college in New Jersey. This program includes both a domestic and a foreign internship. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University offers a course in intensive German for architects (Ferrari 1973).

Kowalski (1974) has designed a course in Russian in response to the ever-increasing business and trade agreements between the United States and the USSR. Commenting on the lack of materials for the course, she observes that "the Soviets print much more pertinent material for the training of their specialists than has come out of our publishing houses." Davies (1977) discusses the increasing demand for specialized language courses in Sweden, and in another article (1975) describes a degree program in International Economics at several universities in Sweden. Coveney (1975) outlines the several "language-plus" engineering programs at the University of Bath in England.

Champagne (1978) presents a syllabus for a multidisciplinary language course in which students investigate problems in their interest area using a foreign language as the tool. A number of community colleges have instituted such courses as "Spanish for Law Enforcement Officers" or "French Commercial Correspondence"; the efforts of one such college in this regard are outlined by Pilkenton (1975). The development of a program entitled "Applied Spanish for the Social Services" at Howard University in Washington, D.C., is summarized by Donahue (1976). A common theme in all these discussions, notably, is a lack of appropriate materials and of qualified instructors. While disturbing to present programs and program directors, this deficiency is almost heartening to present and future foreign language graduates! Although they do not describe specific programs, Gould (1973) and Karr (1973) present journalism and librarianship, respectively, as additional areas that can profitably be combined with language study.

The intent of these specialized courses is not simply to train students at the graduate, undergraduate, or continuing education level, but also to serve the business world itself, both in providing translation and/or interpreting services and in offering language and cultural training to corporate employees. No doubt a fairly aggressive advertising and public relations campaign will need to be undertaken in this regard, though, to alter the great reliance businesses have traditionally placed on commercial language schools for such training. McKay (1977) feels that "the impetus for change will not come from business, or even government, but only from the foreign language profession itself," and of course not all members of the foreign language profession are convinced of the need for change. Clearly not all courses should reflect a specialized purpose since, as Anderson (1974) points out, "we . . . run the risk of becoming a service discipline with little identity of our own." Schneider (1976) adds that "we must pass on to students the aesthetic and humanistic values inherent in the learning of any foreign language"; and, certainly, courses in literature or general purpose language must not be eliminated, since they too meet some students' needs exactly.

At the high school level, too, career education concepts can be blended with the foreign language curriculum. Beusch and DeLorenzo (1977) give examples of some of the activities taking place in the state of Maryland in this regard. Bigelow and Morrison (1975) also present ideas for coordinating the two areas. Lewis (1978) offers suggestions for accommodating teachers who may not feel comfortable with the idea of teaching an interdisciplinary course. Teachers at every level owe it to their students to prepare them for realistic expectations of the working world and to present the broadest possible range of options.

The combination of career education and foreign language training is of great value to the business community and to the foreign language education profession as well. It fills an urgent need in both disciplines and may even lead to a far more enlightened American business presence around the world. Corporations may eventually acquire a cadre of employees far more sophisticated linguistically and more aware interculturally than heretofore thought possible, and in so doing dramatically improve both their business and their public image.

LANGUAGES FOR SPECIAL PURPOSES

A natural outgrowth of the combination of foreign languages and career education/occupational training has been the development of courses in Languages for Special Purposes (LSP). These courses are now being taught at many universities around the world as well as (and perhaps in particular) in employee-training programs of all types. Probably the most popular variant of the LSP course is the English for Special--or Specific--Purposes (ESP) course, and within that domain, English for Science and Technology (EST). This should not be surprising, given the preeminent position of the English-speaking world in science and technology. This in no way, of course, implies any intrinsic superiority of the English language or of its speakers over any other language or group in the world, but the dominance of English and English speakers in the scientific, technological, and business world cannot be denied. To keep pace with the rapid scientific and technological advances and, to be sure, with the ethnocentrism of many British and American companies, many employees of foreign companies--or local national employees of American companies--have learned (and/or been taught) English in varying skills, functional areas, and proficiency levels.

Another important type of ESP program is the one geared to English for Academic Purposes (EAP), which is designed both for foreign students coming to universities in which instruction is in English and for "service" courses in universities abroad. Much has been written concerning the analysis of that segment of language and those specific skills with which the student will have to deal and about the most efficient means of teaching them.

Two of the biggest problems in LSP training are the lack of teaching staff and materials. Since the great majority of LSP teachers are what Strevens (1977) terms "arts trained," they often fear displaying ignorance or making a mistake in front of their scientifically superior students. According to Drobnic (1977), however, the English teacher does not generally need any particular expertise in science or technology to teach EST. Todd Trimble and Trimble (1977), moreover, point out that the arts-trained teacher's literary studies have in fact developed skills in analysis--particularly at the discourse rather than the sentence level--that ordinarily are highly transferable to the EST field. Kapitanoff (1962) denies the need for the teacher of technical Russian, for example, to actually be a scientist, although she stresses that a "broad, highly accurate and contemporary knowledge of basic sciences . . . is highly desirable." Schmitz (1970) feels that the English teacher equipped with some knowledge of technical subjects is superior to the technical specialist who would try to teach English. Ewer and Latorre (1967) recommend the close collaboration of those in the specific disciplines with language course developers, and Coveney (1974) has provided as a teaching aid a teacher's supplement to the student textbook. Teacher training and retraining programs, too, are increasingly including LSP components.

Although the most obvious characteristic of language used in a highly specialized context is its vocabulary, the most highly technical vocabulary of a specialty field is generally left to the study of the specialized discipline itself. Moreover, the technical lexicon does not ordinarily present undue linguistic difficulty, since each term has a precise referent and generally a one-to-one correspondence with the term in the student's native language, if the term even exists there. Furthermore, purely technical terminology constitutes the smallest component of lexical items in a scientific text.

Supporting this finding are the results of a lexical study conducted at Tehran University several years ago (Cowan 1974, Inman 1978b). In an analysis of over 100,000 running words (comprising 4,178 individual lexical items) of scientific and technical prose, technical vocabulary constituted an average of 21 percent of the total sample, although the frequency of occurrence of technical vocabulary throughout the sample increased as the frequency of occur-

rence of individual lexical items decreased. Technical vocabulary includes words that are characteristic of a particular discipline and that do not occur frequently--or at all--in the general language. Among the 1,079 lexical items occurring with greatest frequency, only 7 percent were technical words, whereas in the 1,080 least frequently occurring items (one occurrence each), 37.5 percent were technical.

That stratum of vocabulary included in the LSP course, therefore, is the one generally referred to as subtechnical vocabulary, academic vocabulary, or Fundamental Technical English (context-independent words that occur with high frequency across disciplines, such as 'system,' 'function,' 'process,' 'result'). This type of vocabulary overlaps with the "common core" of a language. This lexicon is further characterized by multiple meanings, some of which become specialized in the context of the specialized prose. In the study at Tehran University mentioned above, subtechnical vocabulary accounted for approximately 70 percent of the total sample, and it occurred at approximately the same frequency throughout the sample. There seems to be no doubt, then, as to the need to focus on this type of vocabulary in LSP courses that prepare students to receive additional education or training.

In the development of employee-training programs, both the technical and linguistic needs of the trainees must be accommodated. Logistical factors and policy and procedural matters of the training effort must be weighed. The language in which to conduct training is central to planning an overseas effort, since all other considerations hinge on that one decision. Program planners often assume that "everyone must learn English," when in fact that may not be warranted at all. An analysis of the register of language appropriate for each type of job or task along with a functional job analysis or task analysis and an assessment of requisite proficiency level must be carried out at the earliest stage of planning in order to predict the type and amount of training required and the language or languages of instruction.[8]

Other factors that must be considered include the mesh of language and technical training (i.e., whether they should be simultaneous, sequential, or overlapping), the extent to which LSP will figure in the program, availability of instructors and teaching materials, location of training, and whether to undertake it as an in-house or a contracted effort. Actual course content and scheduling are also essential planning considerations for effective training, as training and job performance objectives must be coordinated with student/trainee entry levels and anticipated progress. Evaluation measures for student training and on-the-job performance must be proposed. Each potential training configuration must then be assessed for overall feasibility, efficiency, acceptability, propriety, and cost-effectiveness, as well as for such intangible benefits as the advantages to the host country of developing a work force skilled in a second language or proficient in certain other types of skills.

Even if training is contracted rather than conducted in-house, program managers must be aware of these types of considerations so that there may be effective and informed evaluation of proposals and monitoring of contractor performance. The comment made to me that "the [language-training] contract is . . . meager on language, and we have suffered as a result" is surely not unique.[9] Contract administrators, in fact, referring to this same program, freely admitted that the vagueness and generality of the language-training sections of the contract were necessary because "frankly, no one knows anything about it." Clearly much time, effort, and money could have been better directed had improved and more enlightened planning been done.

These program-planning factors have been discussed by a number of training program designers and language professionals. Trim (1976) surveys program considerations specific to adult learners, including methods and the specification of course objectives. Mackay (1975) addresses the linguistic, sociolinguistic, psychological, and pedagogic factors that must be taken into consideration in planning and designing any LSP program. Bachman and Strick (1978) have applied certain principles of econometrics to their program requirements, leading to the quantifiability of needs and resources. In the guidelines for the selection of English language training (see fn. 3, above), considerations for establishing English language-training programs are systematically discussed. Others who have offered detailed descriptions of LSP program development include Jones and Roe (1975), Jung (1978), Frederickson (1978), and Litwack (1978).

James (1974) advocates criterion-referenced language training and evaluation, and proposes that "in effect there are only two relevant levels--adequate and inadequate." Beyond that, he feels that "insistence on levels of proficiency in such circumstances may be simply a side-effect of a desire for 'bilingualism' or 'near native' proficiency--goals as unnecessary as they are, for most students, unattainable." Wilkins and Arnett (1976), too, acknowledge that "proficiency should be equivalent to competency in performing a set of tasks in the target language."

In earlier days of LSP training, lexicon and syntax received the primary focus in analyzing the type of language to be taught. Passages of specialized text were analyzed for frequency and range of occurrence, and materials were developed that incorporated the most frequently

occurring items. More recently, however, analysis at the discourse level has been viewed with increasing importance and included in materials preparation in addition to individual high frequency items (Sinclair and Coulthard 1975, Widdowson 1978).

Emphasis on the communicative function of language has led, too, to the development of a number of types of syllabuses beyond the grammatical, structural, or linguistic syllabus that for so long dictated what would be taught in foreign language courses (Shaw 1977, Alexander 1976). The situational syllabus was favored by some, since it placed language in context instead of in isolation, but it has been criticized as not readily promoting transferability from one situation to another (Wilkins 1972). The notional-functional syllabus (Johnson 1977, Morrow 1977) was felt to promote greater communicative competence, although Widdowson (1978) criticizes it by noting that it is still a list of forms and omits discourse analysis. Still it appears a step in the right direction. Examples of courses that have been developed in England as a direct result of this work are described by Johnson and Morrow (1977) at the University of Reading; and Candlin, Leather, and Bruton (1976) at the University of Lancaster. Indeed the doctor-patient relationship and ability to communicate, discussed by Candlin et al. is so important that, as Shuy (1974) has pointed out, the linguistic and sociolinguistic aspects of the situation should not be considered as topics for EFL classes only.

Currie (1975), looking at recent syllabus developments, feels that EFL teaching in Europe is more closely linked to the communication approach than it is in the United States. Recent work in the Council of Europe has led to the development of the notional syllabus and the definition of a "threshold level" below which the learner cannot function successfully in the language (van Ek 1975). The threshold level was originally developed for English, although Peck (1976) indicates that work is also proceeding on threshold levels for French ('le niveau-seuil'), Spanish, and German. The situational syllabus and the notional-functional syllabus, taking into account as they do actual language use (with attendant sociolinguistic and psychological considerations) may all be considered part of the broad specification of the "communicative syllabus" (Candlin 1976, Stratton 1977). Crucial to the development of this type of syllabus, clearly, is the analysis and specification of language use situations (Freihoff and Takala 1974).

Numerous examples of specific programs in vocationally or occupationally oriented LSP training could be cited. One such example is the three-week course for airline ticket personnel described by Coutts (1974). Rocklyn (1967) has experimented with self-instructional programs in Russian and Mandarin Chinese to train combat soldiers to elicit certain information from captured enemy troops. Perry (1976) has proposed a "systems approach" to second language learning for Canadian armed forces personnel, which appears not unlike those programs developed by the Defense Language Institute and the Foreign Service Institute in the United States. Johnson (1971) discusses Aramco's efforts in teaching English in Saudi Arabia, commenting that the company's philosophy is that training must go beyond simply giving an employee the skills required on his specific job; it must attempt to impart new ways of thinking and reasoning and thus "develop the man to his maximum potential." Plastre (1977) presents a planning model for introducing "functional bilingualism" into Canadian business. Greco (1977) discusses the various language courses offered to certain employees of the European Common Market. Bianchi (1973) outlines the selection of linguistic material for a business ESP course in Germany. Friday and McLeod (1978) and Frederickson (1978) have described in detail the Telemedia program for employees of Bell Helicopter International in Iran.

Another important aspect of ESP has appeared in vocational training programs in the United States. Jacobson and Ball (1978) present guidelines for determining training objectives based on the survival and life-coping skills delineated by Northcutt (1976) in programs for those of limited English-speaking ability in the United States. Grognet, Robson, and Crandall (1978) and Wang, Savage, How, and Young (1978) have also discussed and demonstrated elements of adult vocational English training. This type of training is being offered increasingly by vocational/technical schools, government-sponsored job improvement programs (under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, or CETA), and community colleges; many banks, corporations, and service companies are offering this type of training to their employees as well.

Special purpose language training is now a major component of foreign and second language teaching. The work that is currently being done in this area around the world is sure to have an ever-increasing effect on foreign language curricula at all levels; and, as basic principles of course and program design are expanded and refined, and as communication among researchers and practitioners improves, increasingly sophisticated, efficient, and motivating courses should emerge.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The major findings of the present research have been:

(1) The greatest amount of international business in which U.S. corporations are involved is currently being done in Western Europe, followed by Central and South America, Canada, the Middle East, and the Far East.

(2) Spanish is the language most studied by U.S. nationals going abroad to work and also the language most involved in translation and interpreting.

(3) U.S. corporations doing business abroad rely primarily on English as the business language and the means of communication.

(4) Language training is provided to a majority of U.S. national employees going overseas and outranks technical, cultural, and managerial training in the type of training provided.

(5) Languages for Special Purposes (LSP) training is only rarely included in U.S. national employees' pre-assignment language instruction.

(6) Translation and interpreting requirements are generally handled by corporate employees whose jobs are in a non-language area.

(7) English is generally the language in which technical training is given to non-U.S. national employees overseas.

(8) A far greater commitment exists to language training (specifically English language training) for non-U.S. national employees than for U.S. national employees.

(9) The overwhelming majority of language training for non-U.S. national employees is done in English and is apt to include an LSP (i.e., a job-oriented) component.

(10) For most companies doing international business, language training has played no role in the planning of their overseas operations.

Recommendations

The solution to the language problem in the corporate world is neither simple nor readily forthcoming, yet there are some encouraging movements and trends beginning to emerge. For Americans going abroad to work, the interdisciplinary programs now being adopted in many schools, colleges, and universities in which a foreign language is combined with another field of study (often management, business, or engineering) appear most encouraging. By treating a language capability as an ancillary skill, some foreign language departments are preparing students much more realistically for the world of work that they will encounter after graduation. This view is far from universally accepted, however, and it will have to become much more widespread than it is now in order to have significant impact.

The importance of language and cultural training to the success of international business and to effective communication in general, although cited frequently in the literature of the disciplines of both foreign languages and business, seems to surface in only a cursory fashion

in the present-day U.S. multinational business environment. Moreover, since the value of this training is difficult to demonstrate empirically, companies are not likely to alter their present policies radically as long as they regard their current revenues as acceptable. Pleas to the business community from the language-teaching profession to devote more time and resources to language training are apt to be largely ignored unless companies are convinced that additional foreign language training will significantly enhance their marketing potential. Yet the emergence of dually trained businesspeople from the new non-traditional academic curricula may help to improve the image, the profits, and the effectiveness of day-to-day operations of American businesses operating abroad. Companies appear to be receptive to the idea of hiring "language-plus" trained people, since they acknowledge that they are not without communication problems in the international arena, while at the same time they require technical/professional expertise as the primary criterion for an overseas assignment. Perhaps, over time, the new curricular offerings will help produce a more astute, aware, and empathetic American businessperson.

Because of the high mobility of many international businesspeople, however, this approach will not apply in all cases. A person may spend a year or two in a number of countries and totally disparate language areas throughout his or her career, making language mastery for each location a virtual impossibility. The addition of high level language and area specialists to the international staff would seem to be a viable alternative in cases where language, cultural, and technical expertise cannot be combined in a single individual. Such individuals should be equal in stature and responsibility to the technical specialist member of the team and not just a staff interpreter/translator. This specialist should be more than an advisor or someone to be consulted occasionally; rather he or she should occupy a central role in planning and then in operating the overseas venture. The additional cost of employing such individuals should be more than compensated by the more positive image the company presents, by additional business revenues, and by a reduction of delays, conflicts, and misguided operations.

Robinson (1973) suggests teams composed of two capable executives--one American and one foreign--but the presence of an American who has made the effort to learn the foreign language and who truly understands the host culture would seem more impressive and more effective than the all-too-frequent case of the American being dependent on an English-speaking host country national. An additional advantage to having an American cultural specialist is that he or she is truly part of the company team from the earliest stages of the venture. Inman and LoBello (1975) propose task groups composed of an organizational development specialist; a Westerner who is a specialist in the host country culture and fluent in the host country language; and host country counterparts to the full range of foreign advisers brought in to start up an operation.

Language and cultural training specialists can be of great value, too, in planning, designing, and implementing language-training programs for local national employees in their own countries. These specialists need to be educated and experienced in language training, including LSP considerations, and must be fully capable of directing/coordinating the training programs or of monitoring and evaluating contractor performance, if training is contracted with an outside organization. The excuse given by some companies that "no one knows anything about it" (i.e., language training) is unacceptable and highly detrimental to the timely accomplishment of corporate goals and missions. Some companies, perhaps learning from the experiences of others, have included developers and coordinators of fairly extensive and sophisticated language-training programs even in the initial phases of their overseas operations. Others have plunged in headlong only to be still redeveloping basic programs years later. The importance of adequate and enlightened planning cannot be stressed enough, along with the thorough assessment of employee job-related language and technical training needs. To issue the blanket edict that "all our employees must speak English" is naive and irresponsible: courses tailored to specific needs can be taught much more efficiently than general purpose language courses, which are time consuming, often of limited interest, and usually of minimal value on the job. Because English language skills are the foundation on which subsequent training is based, their importance to the success of an overseas training commitment cannot be overemphasized.

The present study has established a baseline that future studies can update and expand upon. Of great value to follow this study would be in-depth case studies of a number of individual programs, not only in the corporate sphere but among government agencies, non-profit institutions and organizations, schools and universities, and commercial language-teaching organizations as well. Since overall program effectiveness cannot be assessed adequately in detail through mailed questionnaire surveys, program and language policy evaluation should be a central feature of subsequent research. Such studies would require on-site visits and extensive analysis of training data and would ideally encompass training programs for U.S. nationals and non-U.S. nationals, both within the United States and abroad.

Another type of study of value and of high interest would be one similar to the present one but focused on foreign-headquartered international corporations. Such a study would make possible contrasts and comparisons in philosophies, practices, and program requirements, which

would be enlightening indeed. The sample of companies selected for study should include a cross-section of company categories as well as headquarters locations so as to offer as complete a picture as possible. Perhaps separate studies by country of headquarters would allow for more thorough treatment.

Another study related to the matter of corporate language training but encompassing other areas of management, politics, and intercultural communications studies as well, would be a study of business failures in various countries. Such businesses would, of course, be limited to those with international sponsorship or involvement. Research of this type would have to be done by the case-study method, since unearthing details of past company policies and operations is sure to be demanding and time consuming. As an example of the types of situations meriting investigation, an Iranian business consultant once observed that productivity in plants that are started up with the assistance of foreign (not only U.S.) advisers drops significantly as soon as the advisers leave. This situation surely is not unique to Iran and bears examination for trends relating to intercultural communications problems, planning shortcomings, and training inadequacies.

The information gained in this study is of value to language majors, language-teaching professionals, and to the international business community. Employment opportunities in the business world for a person proficient in one or more foreign languages are available, in general, only if that person also possesses a capability in another field that is more directly business or technically oriented. Foreign language educators, knowing this to be the case and cognizant, too, of the fairly level (or only modestly increasing) need for foreign language teachers, have an obligation to point out to their students the realities of the working world and career choices and to attempt to modify course offerings and curricula accordingly. The benefits of "language-plus" trained employees to internationally oriented business and industry should be obvious. By accommodating itself to real-world requirements, the language teaching profession may be able to play a role in expanding corporate concern for the linguistic and cultural aspects of doing business abroad.

NOTES

1. The terms "U.S. national" or "American" and "non-U.S. national" refer throughout to "native speaker of English" and "native speaker of a language other than English" respectively, even though that is not, of course, always the case.

2. Categories of companies included Architecture and Engineering; Automotive; Aviation; Building Materials; Chemical; Communications; Computing; Financial; Foods and Agriculture; Glass and Abrasives; Heavy Construction; Heavy Machinery; Hotels and Restaurants; Machinery and Devices; Management Consultants, Attorneys, and Accountants; Mining; Oil; Oil Service; Operations; Paper and Packaging; Pharmaceutical; Retail; Rubber; Scientific and Precision Instruments; Steel; Transportation; Transportation (Airlines); and Transportation (Auto Rentals).

Most responding corporations had between 1,000 and 50,000 employees and reported annual revenues of between $100 million and $10 billion. Most companies do the majority of their business domestically, i.e., within the United States: 64.3 percent of the responding companies indicated that over 50 percent of their business is domestic. The greatest amount of international business for these respondents is currently being done in Western Europe, followed by the Middle East, Central and South America, and Canada. Most companies (74) indicated that marketing is the primary nature of their international operations, followed by manufacturing (58), service (53), extraction/processing of natural resources (23), and advising/training a foreign company or government (5).

3. These guidelines were published following a conference held at the Center for Applied Linguistics on February 24 and 25, 1978, which assembled a number of professional specialists in English language-teaching program design (see "Conference Will Discuss TESOL Program Standards," The Linguistic Reporter 20, no. 4, January 1978).

4. FSI (Foreign Service Institute) language-rating scales range from 0 to 5, 0 indicating no proficiency at all and 5 indicating native or near-native proficiency. "S" and "R" prefixes indicate a speaking or reading capability.

5. LSP, or Language(s) for Special Purposes, includes English for Special Purposes (ESP), often further refined to EAP (English for Academic Purposes), EOP (English for Occupational Purposes), or EST (English for Science and Technology). These are all subdivisions of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) or English as a Second Language (ESL). EFL generally refers to courses and programs outside an English-speaking country, while ESL is generally taught to non-native speakers of English within an English-speaking milieu. The term LSP refers to the teaching or learning of language for a specialized goal. Courses designed for this purpose have limited objectives and often feature limited skills, and are presented in combination with or as preparation for vocational, professional, or academic needs and/or training. Objectives for LSP courses are frequently stated in terms of performance competencies rather than in terms of specific linguistic items to be mastered.

6. The "Exporter's Kit" is available from the U.S. Department of Commerce, Domestic and International Business Administration, Washington, D.C. 20230.

7. A recent study conducted by the Modern Language Association indicates that the nearly decade-long decline in foreign language enrollments is leveling off and that enrollments in such languages as Spanish, Arabic, and Greek are on the increase (Scully 1978).

8. Register analysis is the analysis of variations of language according to use. These variations are determined by (1) function or purpose (e.g., description, narration, reporting of

results); (2) mode (spoken or written); (3) style (degree of formality); and (4) "province," or specialty according to subject matter (e.g., medicine, technology, etc.). Probably the most common means of performing an analysis of register is by conducting frequency counts (both lexical and syntactic) of authentic sample texts.

Functional job analysis is the analysis of specific vocational tasks, particularly with regard to language, as to competencies and abilities that the performer must control. The level of control is also specified here, since absolute mastery of certain language skills in particular situations may not be necessary.

9. Representative of the Office of the Project Manager, Iranian Aircraft Program, Aviation Systems Command, St. Louis, Missouri; personal communication, December 1, 1976.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abramson, Paul. 1974. Winging it. Training 11, 7: 25-27, 54-55.

Ackermann, Jean Marie. 1974. Transcultural training. Training 11, 7: 28-31, 56.

Adams, T.F.M. and Yuko Kobayashi. 1969. The world of Japanese business. Tokyo: Kodansha.

Adams, Thomas M. 1968. The United States business executive in Latin America. Texas Business Review 42: 191-98.

Aitken, Thomas, Jr. 1973. The multinational man: The role of the manager abroad. London: Allen and Unwin.

Alexander, L.B. 1976. Where do we go from here? A reconsideration of some basic assumptions affecting course design. English Language Teaching Journal 30: 89-103.

Alexander, Loren. 1975. Foreign language skills in manufacturing firms: Kansas, 1974. Bulletin of the Association of Departments of Foreign Languages (ADFL Bulletin) 7, 2: 33-37.

Allow two years to select, train managerial staff for new overseas operation, businessmen are told. 1966. International Commerce 72, 2.

Anderson, Charlotte. 1974. The role of foreign languages in the total curriculum. ADFL Bulletin 6, 1: 20-22.

_____. 1977. The college and the nonacademic community. ADFL Bulletin 9, 2: 37-38.

Angel, Juvenal L., comp. 1975. Directory of American firms operating in foreign countries. 8th ed. New York: World Trade Academy Press.

Arnett, M. Rex. 1975a. Languages for the world of work. Executive Summary. Salt Lake City: Olympus Research Corporation. ED 119 501.

_____. 1975b. Languages for the world of work: Implications of a recent study. Paper presented to annual meeting of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). ED 116 507.

_____. 1976. Languages for the world of work. ADFL Bulletin 7, 4: 14-25.

Arnold, Don W., Robert L. Morgenroth, and William M. Morgenroth. 1975. A survey of foreign language use in business and of trends in foreign language education in Illinois. ADFL Bulletin 7, 2: 27-33.

Arnold, Edwin P. 1973. A foreign language vocational opportunities guidance center. ADFL Bulletin 5, 1: 30-32.

Azzi, Robert. 1978. The Saudis go for broke. Fortune 98, 2: 110-13.

Bachman, Lyle F. and Gregory J. Strick. 1978. An analytic approach to language program design. Paper presented at annual meeting of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL).

Barnard, Helen. 1971. Advanced English vocabulary. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Beeth, Gunnar. 1973. International management practice: An insider's view. New York: AMACOM.

Beusch, Ann A. and William E. DeLorenzo. 1977. Blending career education concepts with the foreign language curriculum: Re[illegible] to the challenge. Foreign Language Annals 10: 9-17.

Bianchi, Mary. 1973. The selection of linguistic material for the VHS certificate "English for business purposes." In de Grève et al., pp. 165-71.

Bigelow, Barbara and Norman Morrison. 1975. Foreign languages in career training. Camp Springs, Md.: Crossland Senior High School. ED 100 191.

Bomse, Marguerite D. 1973. Meeting the needs and interests of students and the community in the language curriculum. ADFL Bulletin 5, 1: 40-41.

Brawley, James. 1969. The technical translator in industry and the problems surrounding his profession. Babel 15: 213-15.

Brod, Richard I. 1974. Careers and the foreign language department. ADFL Bulletin 6, 2: 16-22.

Bull, William E. 1964. The use of vernacular languages in education. In Dell Hymes, ed., Language in culture and society, pp. 527-33. New York: Harper and Row.

Business International Corporation. 1970. Compensating international executives. New York: Business International Corporation.

Candlin, Christopher N. 1976. Communicative language teaching and the debt to pragmatics. In Clea Rameh, ed., Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics 1976, pp. 237-56. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

_____, Jonathan H. Leather, and Clive J. Bruton. 1976. Doctors in casualty: Applying communicative competence to components of specialist course design. International Review of Applied Linguistics 14: 245-72.

Carroll, John B. 1967. The foreign language attainments of language majors in the senior year. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Champagne, Roland A. 1978. Responding to the challenge of survival: Multidisciplinary language courses. Foreign Language Annals 11: 81-85.

Chan, Graham K.L. 1976. The foreign language barrier in sciences and technology. International Library Review 8: 317-25.

Chiu, Rosaline K. 1972. Measuring register characteristics: A prerequisite for preparing advanced level TESOL programs. TESOL Quarterly 6: 129-41.

Chorafas, Dimitris N. 1969. The communication barrier in international management. New York: American Management Association, Inc.

Cleveland, Harlan, Gerald J. Mangone, and John Clarke Adams. 1960. The overseas Americans. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Coley, William and Martha Franke. 1974. Career education questionnaire. College Park, Md.: University of Maryland, Department of Foreign Language Education. Xeroxed.

Collins, Michael J. 1977. A selection of language. ELI Monthly 19. Dhahran, Saudi Arabia: University of Petroleum and Minerals.

Colquitt, J., et al. 1974. An analysis of multinational corporations' perceptions of their requirements for international MBA degree holders. Dallas: University of Dallas. ED 096 836.

The corporate word in fifty-nine languages. 1974. Fortune 89, 3: 28.

Coutts, Jennifer. 1974. Industrial language training. Audio-Visual Language Journal 12: 11-21, 27.

Coveney, J. 1974. French for engineers. In Perren, ed., pp. 47-49.

Coveney, J. 1975. The teaching of languages to technologists. System 3: 125-27.

Cowan, J R. 1974. Lexical and syntactic research for the design of EFL reading materials. TESOL Quarterly 8: 389-99.

_____, Lynn Bauman, Eleanor Mackelduff, Rosemary Elkins, Carol Trupin, and Minoo Varzegar. 1974. English for medical students, vol. 1. Tehran: Tehran University Press.

Crispin, André. 1974. Foreign languages beyond the campus. ADFL Bulletin 5, 3: 50-51.

Currie, William B. 1975. European syllabuses in English as a foreign language. Language Learning 25: 339-54.

Davies, Norman F. 1975. International economics--A degree course integrating languages and business studies. System 3: 128-32.

_____. 1977. The changing role of the university language department. System 5: 38-45.

De Camp, Joseph E., Jr. 1973. ADFL forum: Foreign languages and careers. ADFL Bulletin 5, 2: 51-52.

de Grève, M., M. Gorosch, C.G. Sandulescu, and F. van Passel, eds. 1973. Modern language teaching to adults: Language for special purposes. Brussels: Association Internationale de Méthodes Audiovisuelles, and Paris: Didier.

Donahue, Moraima de Semprún. 1976. Applied Spanish for the social services: A different approach to foreign languages. ADFL Bulletin 7, 3: 28-29.

Drobnic, Karl, ed. 1977. English for Science and Technology Newsletter 1, 1.

Eddy, Peter A. 1975. Foreign language skills and jobs. Paper presented at annual meeting of the Pacific Northwest Council on Foreign Languages. ED 138 042.

Elton, Maurice G. 1974. Viable alternatives. ADFL Bulletin 5, 4: 12-15.

Emmans, Keith, E. Hawkins, and A. Westoby. 1974. The use of foreign languages in the private sector of industry and commerce. York, England: York University Language Teaching Centre. ED 101 577.

Ewer, J.R. and E. Hughes-Davies. 1971. Further notes on developing an English programme for students of science and technology (1). English Language Teaching Journal 26: 65-70.

Ewer, J.R. and E. Hughes-Davies. 1971. Further notes on developing an English programme for students of science and technology (2). English Language Teaching Journal 26: 269-73.

Ewer, J.R. and G. Latorre. 1967. Preparing an English course for students of science. English Language Teaching Journal 21: 221-29.

Ferrari, Lucy. 1973. An intensive course in German for architects. ADFL Bulletin 5, 2: 48-49.

Fine, Sidney A. 1973. Functional job analysis scales. Methods for manpower analysis, no. 7. Kalamazoo, Mich.: The W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.

_____ and Wretha W. Wiley. 1971. An introduction to functional job analysis. Methods for manpower analysis, no. 4. Kalamazoo, Mich.: The W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.

Fiske, Edward B. 1977. About education. The New York Times, March 23, p. 42.

Fitzjohn, B. 1974. Problems of organisation. In Perren, ed., pp. 19-23.

The Fortune directory of the 500 largest U.S. industrial corporations. 1977. Fortune 95, 5: 364-91.

Frautschi, Richard L. 1978. The French-business major at Penn State. ADFL Bulletin 9, 3: 31-33.

Frederickson, Charles. 1978. How to develop an English for Special Purposes (ESP) curriculum. In Mary Todd Trimble, Louis Trimble, and Karl Drobnic, eds., English for specific purposes: Science and technology, pp. 295-312. Corvallis: English Language Institute, Oregon State University.

Freihoff, Roland and Sauli Takala. 1974. A systematic description of language teaching objectives based on the specification of language use situations. Abridged version. Reports from the Language Centre, no. 3, Finland. ED 109 893.

Freudenstein, Reinhold. n.d. Teaching and learning foreign languages in industry. ED 102 865.

Friday, Carol and Beverly McLeod. 1978. A model for ESP curriculum development. Presentation at annual meeting of TESOL.

Fries, Charles C. 1945. Teaching and learning English as a foreign language. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Fryer, T. Bruce. 1975. Foreign languages and business: A lifelong experience. Paper presented at annual meeting of Southeast Conference on Language Teaching. ED 125 278.

Fulbright, J. William. 1977. International education: Focus for corporate support. Harvard Business Review 55, 3: 137-41.

Galbraith, John Kenneth. 1978. The defense of the multinational company. Harvard Business Review 56, 2: 83-93.

García-Zamor, Marie and Mary J. Krowitz. 1974. Contextual testing and communicative competence. Paper presented at annual meeting of Linguistic Society of America. ED 104 145.

Gingold, K. 1966. A guide to better translations for industry. Babel 12: 142-45.

Gonzalez, Richard F. and Anant R. Negandhi. 1967. The United States executive: His orientation and career patterns. East Lansing: Michigan State University, Graduate School of Business Administration.

Gould, Loyal. 1973. Languages in communication: Expanded opportunities for language majors in business and industry. ADFL Bulletin 4, 3: 34-36.

Gouvernayre, P. and G. Lauvergeon. 1974. Expanding abroad: How do you feel about languages? ED 123 901.

Greco, Mario. 1977. La formation professionnelle du personnel de la Commission des Communautés européennes, avec une attention particulière à la formation linguistique. Canadian Modern Language Review 33: 708-20.

Grognet, Allene, Barbara Robson, and Jodi Crandall. 1978. ESP-Vocational/Manpower English workshop. Presentation at annual meeting of TESOL. [Materials available from CAL.]

Halvorson, Glenn, James Moniz, and Kurt C. Nathan. 1978. Foreign languages and corporate study: A successful marriage. ADFL Bulletin 9, 3: 24-26.

Harrison, Ann Tukey. 1973. "What can I do with it?"--Vocational counseling for language students. ADFL Bulletin 5, 1: 37-39.

Hayden, Rose L. 1975. "In the national interest": International education and language policy. ADFL Bulletin 6, 3: 11-18.

Hays, Richard D. 1970. Behavioral aspects of U.S. expatriate managers. Working paper series. Tulane University, Graduate School of Business Administration.

Hecker, Susan. 1973. Survey of foreign language skills in business and service organizations. ADFL Bulletin 5, 2: 3-4.

Holschuh, Albrecht. 1975. Certificates in ancillary language skills. ADFL Bulletin 6, 4: 38-39.

Honig, Lucille J. and Richard I. Brod. 1974. Foreign languages and careers. The Modern Language Journal 58: 157-85. Reprinted by the Modern Language Association.

Howard, Cecil G. 1974. Overseas compensation practices of U.S. firms. Washington, D.C.: American University Business Council for International Understanding.

Increasing need for FL majors in business. 1978. !Albricias! 21, 2: 1-2.

Inman, David P. and Meredith J. LoBello. 1975. Toward an intercultural management model for the Middle East. Unpublished manuscript.

Inman, Marianne. 1978a. An investigation of the foreign language needs of U.S. corporations doing business abroad. Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin. FL 010 113.

_____. 1978b. Lexical analysis of scientific and technical prose. In Mary Todd Trimble, Louis Trimble, and Karl Drobnic, eds., English for specific purposes: Science and technology, pp. 242-56. Corvallis: English Language Institute, Oregon State University.

_____, Lynn Bauman, Rosemary Elkins, Mersedeh Noormohamadian, and Carol Trupin. 1974. English for medical students, vol. 2. Tehran: Tehran University Press.

Ivancevich, John M. 1969. Predeparture training for overseas: A study of American manager training for overseas transfer. Training and Development Journal 23, 2: 36-40.

Jackson, Mary. 1971. Let's make foreign language study more relevant. Today's Education 60, 3: 18-20.

Jacobson, Kathleen and Lynda Ball. 1978. Adapting and developing ESL-occupational coping skills materials. Workshop presented at annual meeting of TESOL.

James, C. Vaughn. 1974. Estimating adult needs. In Perren, ed., pp. 76-90.

Japanese managers tell how their system works. 1977. Fortune 96, 5: 126-32, 136, 138.

Johnson, Charles D. 1971. Presentation to Beirut conference on adult English for national development. In Adult English for national development, pp. 55-65. ED 130 525.

Johnson, Harvey L. 1973. Actual occupational outlook for graduates in foreign languages. ADFL Bulletin 5, 1: 33-36.

Johnson, Keith. 1977. The adoption of functional syllabuses for general language teaching courses. Canadian Modern Language Review 33: 667-80.

_____ and Keith Morrow. 1977. Meeting some social language needs of overseas students. Canadian Modern Language Review 33: 694-707. Also ED 134 033.

Joiner, Elizabeth C. 1975. The retraining of humanists for programs in international business. Paper presented at annual meeting of Southeast Conference on Language Teaching. ED 113 937.

Jones, Keith and Peter Roe. 1975. Designing English for Science and Technology (EST) programmes. In English for academic study: Problems and perspectives, pp. 11-42. London: The British Council, English Teaching Information Centre.

Jung, Clayton J. 1978. Units of instruction and methodological procedures. Paper presented at annual meeting of TESOL.

Kapitanoff, Lorraine. 1962. The teaching of technical Russian. In Thomas F. Wagner, ed., The teaching of Russian: Reports and papers. ED 031 126.

Karr, Susan. 1973. Foreign languages and careers in libraries. ADFL Bulletin 4, 4: 22-23.

Keesee, Elizabeth. 1972. Vocational opportunities. Hispania 55: 632-43.

Kertesz, François. 1974. How to cope with the foreign-language problem: Experience gained at a multidisciplinary laboratory. Journal of the American Society for Information Science 25, 2: 86-104.

Kolde, E.J. 1974. The multinational company. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, D.C. Heath.

Korda, Michael. 1975. Power! How to get it, how to use it. New York: Ballantine.

Kowalski, Luba H. 1974. Russian for business and commerce. ADFL Bulletin 6, 1: 42-45.

Kučera, Henry and W. Nelson Francis. 1967. American English. Providence, R.I.: Brown University Press.

Lee, E.V. 1977/78. Non-specialist use of foreign languages in industry and commerce. Audio-Visual Language Journal 15: 223-31.

Lesley, Tay. 1975. English through business and business through English. Paper presented at annual meeting of TESOL. ED 122 595.

Lewis, Paula Gilbert. 1978. Practical problems and solutions for teacher "re-preparation" for interdisciplinary foreign language and literature courses. Foreign Language Annals 11: 315-17.

Lippmann, Jane N. 1974. Rationale for language study. In Gilbert A. Jarvis, ed., The challenge of communication, pp. 37-69. Skokie, Ill.: National Textbook Company.

Litwack, David, et al. 1978. Procedure: The key to developing an ESP curriculum. English for Science and Technology Newsletter 15: 2-4.

Lloyd, Gary E. 1972. An international career. Journal of College Placement 32, 3: 53-57.

Long, Michael. 1976. Encouraging language acquisition by adults in a formal instructional setting. ELT Documents (76/3). London: The British Council, English Teaching Information Centre. ED 136 606.

Lyne, A.A. 1975. A word frequency count of French business correspondence. International Review of Applied Linguistics 13: 95-110.

Mackay, Ronald. 1975. Languages for special purposes. Edutec 3: 24-33. Also ED 117 952.

Macmillan, Matthew. 1971. Recent research for special English courses. In Adult English for national development, pp. 41-53. ED 130 525.

Mareschal, Roger. 1977. Normes linguistiques: Détermination, description, contenu, utilité. Canadian Modern Language Review 33: 620-31.

Marottoli, Vincent. 1973. The success of the private language schools: A lesson to be learned. Foreign Language Annals 6: 354-58.

Martin, Anne V. 1976. Teaching academic vocabulary to foreign graduate students. TESOL Quarterly 10: 91-98.

McDonald, Peter F. and J.C. Sager. 1975. Beyond contextual studies. International Review of Applied Linguistics 13: 19-34.

McGregor, Douglas. 1967. The professional manager. New York: McGraw-Hill.

McKay, Thomas K. 1977. Language courses for special purposes: Some implications and indictments. Master's thesis, Brigham Young University.

Merklein, Helmut A. 1974. Languages and business. ADFL Bulletin 5, 4: 7-9.

_____. 1975. Languages for the world of work. In Material development needs in the uncommonly-taught languages: Priorities for the seventies, pp. 26-35. Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics. ED 112 643.

_____ and George S. Cooley. 1974. International business without foreign languages? Accent on ACTFL 4: 10-11.

Merklein, Helmut A. and Bogumil W. Frenk. 1974. Career perceptions of foreign language majors. ADFL Bulletin 5, 4: 9-12.

Morgenroth, Robert L., Louis H. Parks, and William M. Morgenroth. 1975. Progress report on the South Carolina market for foreign languages study. ED 119 471.

Morrow, Keith E. 1977. Teaching the functions of language. English Language Teaching Journal 17: 9-15.

Moulin, André. 1975. Foreign languages for non-linguists: Assessing the needs and defining the teaching approaches. System 3: 88-97.

Northcutt, Norvell. 1976. The adult performance level competency-based high school diploma project. Austin, Texas: The University of Texas at Austin.

Notes for the corporate nomad: Learning languages. 1971. Fortune 83, 3: 42.

Oates, David. 1973. Running a tight ship at East Asiatic. International Management 28, 12: 18-22.

Peck, Anthony J. 1976. Functional-notional syllabuses and their importance for defining levels of linguistic proficiency. Audio-Visual Language Journal 14: 95-105.

Perren, G.E., ed. 1974. Teaching languages to adults for special purposes. CILT reports and papers, no. 11. London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching. ED 100 172.

Perry, Major F.A. 1976. The systems approach to basic English language training in the Canadian armed forces. System 4: 178-81.

Phatak, Arvind. 1974. Managing multinational corporations. New York: Praeger.

Pilkenton, W.D. 1975. A proposal to develop individualized materials for limited-objective career Spanish programs. ADFL Bulletin 6, 3: 39-40.

Plastre, Guy. 1977. Essai en planning linguistique à l'intention des entreprises. Canadian Modern Language Review 33: 647-59.

Potter, David. 1977. Business takes an interest in language majors. The Christian Science Monitor, August 15, p. 28.

Potter, Edith J. 1971. Revitalization of foreign language programs in higher education. Foreign Language Annals 5: 206-10.

Praninskas, Jean. 1972. American University word list. London: Longman.

Primeau, John K. 1975. The MBA degree and the modern language major. ADFL Bulletin 7, 2: 23-25.

Puangmali, Suraprom. 1976. A study of engineering English vocabulary. RELC Journal 7, 1: 40-52.

Rassias, John A. 1972. Why we must change. ADFL Bulletin 3, 3: 9-13.

Reschke, Claus. 1977. Career education at the college level: A modest proposal. ADFL Bulletin 9, 1: 43-47. Also ED 132 881.

Richterich, René. 1973. Modèle pour la définition des besoins langagiers des adultes apprenant une langue vivante. In de Grève et al., pp. 91-133.

Ricks, David A., Marilyn Y.F. Fu, and Jeffrey S. Arpan. 1974. International business blunders. Columbus, Ohio: Grid, Inc.

Rivers, Wilga M. 1973. The non-major: Tailoring the course to the person, not the image. ADFL Bulletin 5, 2: 12-18.

Robinson, Richard D. 1973. International business management: a guide to decision making. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Rocklyn, Eugene H. 1967. The development and testing of a special purpose foreign language training concept. International Review of Applied Linguistics 5: 27-36.

Roessler, Helmut R. 1974. Business courses in German at the American Graduate School of International Management. ADFL Bulletin 6, 2: 14-16.

Salager, Françoise. 1977. Optimum foundations of English technical literature and their applications to the comprehension training of non-English speaking scientists: A statistical approach. Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin.

Savard, Jean-Guy. 1977. Besoins langagiers et fonctions langagières. Canadian Modern Language Review 33: 632-46.

Saville-Troike, Muriel. 1974. TESOL today: The need for new directions. ED 096 833.

Schmitz, Albert. 1970. Technisches Englisch an der Volkshochschule. [Technical English in institutes of higher education]. Englisch an Volkshochschulen (Munich) 23: 371-76.

Schneider, Gerd K. 1976. Rationales for foreign language study: What are our goals? ADFL Bulletin 7, 3: 19-21.

Schultz, Gordon F. 1977. How to get a job overseas with an American firm or affiliate. Burbank, Cal.: Overseas Employment Guides.

Schumann, John H. 1976. Social distance as a factor in second language acquisition. Language Learning 26: 135-44.

Schwartz, William L., Lawrence A. Wilkins, and Arthur G. Bovée. 1932. Vocational opportunities for foreign language students. The Modern Language Journal 16: 545-82.

Scully, Malcolm G. 1977. The Middlebury approach: Immersion. The Chronicle of Higher Education 15, December 12, pp. 1, 12.

_____. 1978. Decline in foreign-language study may be ending. The Chronicle of Higher Education 16, May 30, p. 7.

Shaw, A.M. 1977. Foreign-language syllabus development: Some recent approaches. Language Teaching and Linguistics: Abstracts 10: 217-33.

Shuy, Roger. 1974. Problems of communication in the cross-cultural medical interview. Working papers in sociolinguistics, no. 19. Austin, Texas: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. ED 126 691.

Sinclair, J. McH. and R.M. Coulthard. 1975. Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils. London: Oxford University Press.

Slessarev, Helga. 1974. The international business option at the University of Cincinnati. ADFL Bulletin 6, 2: 7-9.

Spiegelberg, Mary Feirn. 1976. Career education and the teaching of foreign languages. Foreign Language Annals 9: 160-64.

Standard and Poor's register of corporations, directors, and executives. 1977. New York: Standard and Poor's.

Stebinger, Arnold. 1975. The value of foreign languages in business. Paper presented at annual meeting of the Southeast Conference on Language Teaching. ED 113 938.

Steiner, Florence. 1974. Career education and its implications at the national level. The Modern Language Journal 58: 186-91.

Stratton, Florence. 1977. Putting the communicative syllabus in its place. TESOL Quarterly 11: 131-41.

Strevens, Peter. 1971. English for special purposes: A specialist's viewpoint. In Adult English for national development, pp. 25-40. ED 130 525.

_____. 1977. Special-purpose language learning: A perspective. Language Teaching and Linguistics: Abstracts 10: 145-63.

Terras, Rita. 1975. The "market" for German-speaking employees: A survey of business and non-academic organizations. ADFL Bulletin 6, 3: 26-28.

Tinsley, Royal L., Jr. 1973. Guidelines for college and university programs in translator training. ADFL Bulletin 4, 4: 15-21.

Todd Trimble, R.M. and Louis Trimble. 1977. Literary training and the teaching of scientific and technical English to non-native speakers. English Teaching Forum 15, 2: 11-17.

Trim, J.L.M. 1976. Languages for adult learners. Language Teaching and Linguistics: Abstracts 9: 73-92.

Troike, Rudolph C. 1976. The view from the Center: Of linguistics and policy makers. The Linguistic Reporter 19, 2: 2.

Twarog, Leon J. 1977. Beyond survival: The role of foreign language programs in the high schools and two-year colleges. ADFL Bulletin 8, 3: 10-14.

UNESCO. 1953. The use of vernacular languages in education. Monographs on fundamental education, no. 8. Paris: UNESCO.

van Ek, J.A. 1975. Systems development in adult language learning: The threshold level in a European unit/credit scheme for modern language learning by adults. Strasbourg: Council for Cultural Cooperation. ED 108 482.

Vogel, Peter P. 1968. Round 2 in international business. Business Horizons 11, 4: 57-62.

Walser, F. Leroy. 1973. A preliminary look at potential job alternatives for bilingual students and students of foreign languages: A career education concept. ADFL Bulletin 4, 4: 12-14.

Walser, F. Leroy. 1974. Career education holds FL challenge. Hispania 57: 147-49. Reprinted from Accent on ACTFL, September, 1973.

_____. 1978. Languages that work for us: Should the role of foreign languages be rethought? ADFL Bulletin 9, 3: 11-13.

Wang, Wayne, Lynn Savage, Mamie How, and Ellen Young. 1978. Vocational ESL for beginning level adults. Workshop presented at annual meeting of TESOL.

Weinstein, Allen I. 1975. Foreign language majors: The Washington perspective. ADFL Bulletin 6, 4: 18-27.

White, Ronald V. 1974a. Communicative competence, registers, and second language teaching. International Review of Applied Linguistics 12: 127-41.

_____. 1974b. The concept of register and TESL. TESOL Quarterly 8: 401-16.

Widdowson, H.G. 1978. ESP: Criteria for course design. Paper presented at annual meeting of TESOL.

Wilkins, D.A. 1972. Grammatical, situational and notional syllabuses. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. ED 136 549.

Wilkins, Ernest J. and M. Rex Arnett. 1976. Languages for the world of work. Final report. Salt Lake City: Olympus Research Corporation.

Wilkins, Ernest J., Richard I. Brod, William DeLorenzo, Peter A. Eddy, Dora Kennedy, and Rosemary Tripp. 1977. Foreign language instruction and career preparation: A selected, annotated bibliography. CAL·ERIC/CLL series on languages and linguistics, no. 51. Arlington, Va.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics. ED 138 113.

Wilkins, Wynona H. 1976. Corporate competition for foreign language customers: Is there an answer? Foreign Language Annals 9: 519-24.

Wines, Michael. 1973. As more companies send men to foreign lands, language schools thrive--and help solve problems. The Wall Street Journal, August 20, p. 20.

Winter, Elmer L. 1968. Your future in jobs abroad. New York: Richard Rosens Press.

[Documents identified by an ED number may be read on microfiche at an ERIC library collection or ordered from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, P.O. Box 190, Arlington, VA 22210. Documents with FL numbers are being processed by EDRS and will be assigned ED numbers upon publication in Resources in Education.]

Marianne Inman (Ph.D., The University of Texas at Austin) has taught and prepared ESP materials with the University of Illinois-Tehran University TEFL program in Iran and has taught in foreign language programs at Northern Virginia Community College and Southwestern University. She has presented several papers concerning special purpose linguistic research and language training and the combination of foreign languages and career education to professional associations in both Iran and the United States, and is the author of "Lexical Analysis of Scientific and Technical Prose" (in English for Specific Purposes: Science and Technology, 1978).

LANGUAGE IN EDUCATION: THEORY AND PRACTICE

Volume 1 (1977-78)

1. *Directory of Foreign Language Service Organizations*, by Sophia Behrens. $3.95. (ED 153 503)

2. *The Linguist in Speech Pathology*, by Walt Wolfram. $2.95. (ED 153 504)

3. *Graduate Theses and Dissertations in English as a Second Language: 1976-77*, by Stephen Cooper. $2.95. (ED 153 505)

4. *Code Switching and the Classroom Teacher*, by Guadalupe Valdés-Fallis. $2.95. (ED 153 506)

5. *Current Approaches to the Teaching of Grammar in ESL*, by David M. Davidson. $2.95. (ED 154 620)

6. *From the Community to the Classroom: Gathering Second-Language Speech Samples*, by Barbara F. Freed. $2.95. (ED 157 404)

7. *Kinesics and Cross-Cultural Understanding*, by Genelle G. Morain. $2.95. (ED 157 405)

8. *New Perspectives on Teaching Vocabulary*, by Howard H. Keller. $2.95. (ED 157 406)

9. *Teacher Talk: Language in the Classroom*, by Shirley B. Heath. $2.95. (ED 158 575)

10. *Language and Linguistics: Bases for a Curriculum*, by Julia S. Falk. $2.95. (ED 158 576)

11. *Teaching Culture: Strategies and Techniques*, by Robert C. Lafayette. $2.95. (ED 157 407)

12. *Personality and Second Language Learning*, by Virginia D. Hodge. $2.95. (ED [illegible]08)

Volume 2 (1978-79)

13. *Games and Simulations in the Foreign Language Classroom*, by Alice C. Omaggio. $5.95.

14. *Problems and Teaching Strategies in ESL Composition*, by Ann Raimes. $2.95.

15. *Graduate Theses and Dissertations in English as a Second Language: 1977-78*, by Stephen Cooper. $2.95.

16. *Foreign Languages, English as a Second/Foreign Language, and the U.S. Multinational Corporation*, by Marianne Inman. $4.95.

17. *Testing Oral Communication in the Foreign Language Classroom*, by Walter H. Bartz. $2.95.

18. *Intensive Foreign Language Courses*, by David P. Benseler and Renate A. Schulz. $3.95.

19. *Evaluating a Second Language Program*, by Gilbert A. Jarvis and Shirley J. Adams. $2.95.

20. *Reading a Second Language*, by G. Truett Cates and Janet K. Swaffar. $2.95.

21. *Chicano English*, by Allan A. Metcalf. $2.95.

22. *Adult Vocational ESL*, by Jo Ann Crandall. $3.95.

To subscribe to the complete series of publications, write to the Publications Department, Center for Applied Linguistics, 1611 North Kent Street, Arlington, Virginia 22209. The subscription rate is $32.00 per volume. Titles may also be ordered individually; add $1.75 postage and handling. Virginia residents add 4% sales tax. All orders must be prepaid.